

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06823383 6

☆Penn. Soc.

July 18, 08

(Jeffrey)

ZH-

The Great Mystery

“ BUT what avail inadequate words to reach
The innermost of Truth? Who shall essay,
Blinded and weak, to point and lead the way,
Or solve the mystery in familiar speech?
Yet, if it be that something not thy own,
Some shadow of the Thought to which our schemes,
Creeds, cult, and ritual are at best but dreams,
Is even to thy unworthiness made known,
Thou mayst not hide what yet thou shouldst not dare
To utter lightly, lest on lips of thine
The real seem false, the beauty undivine.
So, weighing duty in the scale of prayer,
Give what seems given thee. It may prove a seed
Of goodness dropped in fallow-grounds of need.”

—WHITTIER.

The Great Mystery

Two Studies on the Same Subject

One in the Book of Revelation
the Other in the Book of Nature

BY

ELIZABETH MILLER JEFFERYS

AND

WILLIAM HAMILTON JEFFERYS, A.M., M.D.

“This is a Great Mystery.”—EPH. v. 32.

PHILADELPHIA

GEORGE W. JACOBS & CO \

103-105 SOUTH FIFTEENTH STREET

E.L



Copyright, 1901, by
ELIZABETH MILLER JEFFERYS
AND
WILLIAM HAMILTON JEFFERYS.

Preface

THE books of God are two, and all that He has taught us of Himself, His works and ways;—His essential Being and its manifestations, is contained in these two books. And they must agree; they cannot contradict each other; for their Author is one and the same, and He is Divine.

If we do not feel their harmony, it is because something is wanting in us, not in them. We have not all the facts in the case, we cannot understand the language in which the records are written. And we are too impatient, we cannot wait.

Men are realizing more and more, that the teaching of the Bible is progressive, just as the teaching of Nature is. But how differently men deal with the two books! Nature students are reverent. They desire ardently to learn what Nature has to teach, they search and study to draw from Nature her secrets. But Bible

study to-day seems to mean destructive criticism. Jesus did not so deal with His Father's book. He came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil, to fill up, (that which was wanting). His teaching was a development of the older teaching, but the germs were all there. Who can doubt that there are other great truths whose germs lie hidden in the book of God, waiting to reward the searcher who has the reverent heart and the childlike spirit!

Dr. A. J. Mason, after conceding that the utmost deference should be paid to the general opinion of Christians of past ages, goes on to say: "This by no means excludes the necessity of fresh investigations into the meaning of Scripture. In the first place, there are large tracts of the New Testament¹ which have never received any authoritative interpretation, and which abundantly repay study; and, in the second place, even in some instances where it may be said that there is something like an authoritative interpretation, the authority is mainly concerned to assert a general principle of belief which must not be contravened, rather than to assert that the

¹ Are there not large tracts in the Old Testament also?

belief is expressed in the text in question. It may be readily conceded that the Church is, in a general sense, the interpreter of Scripture, without holding that a long current interpretation of a particular passage is critically correct.”¹

The true theological method of regarding doctrine is thus set forth: “It considers the doctrinal substance of the Scriptures as a living seed, capable of the most prolific development. In the midst of the most unfavorable influences, it retains the formative energy by which it evokes new and living products adapted to the times. It always recurs to the Scriptures, and measures the products by this canon, but those plants which spring from biblical roots, it will neither drive back into their roots nor cut off.”²

I ask the readers of the First Study to consider whether the doctrine therein set forth be not “a plant springing from biblical roots,” “a new and living product adapted to the times.”

The Second Study is intended to show how the lesson taught implicitly in the Book of Revelation, lying everywhere in germ ready to

¹ Mason's “Conditions of Our Lord's Life on Earth,” p. 14.

² Hagenback's “History of Doctrine,” p. 24.

spring to the light, is taught explicitly and most clearly on every page of the great Book of Nature; thus does each very wonderfully confirm and complement the other. The second argument will doubtless meet with a more ready acceptance than the first. For men's ears are ever open to hear Nature's voices, and their hearts to receive her teachings.

The first of the two studies in this book was written in its present shape¹ in April, 1867, thirty-three years ago, the intention being shortly to recast and publish it in book or pamphlet form. After much thought, it was decided that the time had not yet come.

Since then many things have changed. The trend of modern thought both religious and scientific, has been most decidedly in the direction of such an idea of God as is set forth in this study.

One who was unborn when this paper was written, now insists that it should see the light. He has offered to do that part for which I am quite incompetent, that is, to prepare the second paper showing the argument from the Book of

¹ That of a letter to my father.

Nature, for such an idea of God, for which special studies have fitted him. It would seem that the time indeed has come. And it may be that I have been spared to give my testimony before I go hence. So that I dare not refuse. May the Divine Spirit accept and bless our work!

E. M. J.

Philadelphia, November 29, 1900.

Study in the Book of Revelation

“The things that are in heaven who hath searched out, and Thy counsel who hath known, except Thou give Wisdom, and send Thy Holy Spirit from above?”—WISDOM ix. 16, 17.

To
The Beloved and Honored Memory
of
My Father and Mother

Note Introductory to First Study

THE reason why I have insisted on the date (April 14th, 1867) of the following letter is this: In 1884 there appeared anonymously a religious romance, "Arius the Libyan," wherein were some things that I might be accused of having appropriated, had my article been written after that date. I wish therefore to be able to say that the following letter stands just as it was written, seventeen years before "Arius the Libyan" was in print. I have indeed omitted a few things, some because they were of a personal character, others because they seemed unnecessary, but I have added nothing and changed nothing.

The notes which follow the letter and are marked "A, B, C," and so on to "O," were part of the original document, and were sent to my father with the letter. The notes inserted in the body of the letter and the footnotes have been added in preparing it for publication.

April 14th, 1867.

MY DEAR FATHER:

I have long wished to have a talk with you on a subject which has been lying very deep in my heart for a long time; but the subject is one so difficult to broach, and so difficult to treat,—the thoughts which I have had are so hard to put in words;—that I am at last driven to a strange plan (under the circumstances) that of throwing what I have to say in the form of a letter.

I ask beforehand your indulgent patience, and if anything you read should, as it very possibly may, startle or shock you by its very newness and strangeness,—when I tell you that the idea herein developed is the gradual growth of ten years, beginning with my first serious thoughts of religion,—a conviction gradually deepening all that time, until I have at last found courage to give it a tangible shape,—I am sure you will at least not accuse me of intentional irreverence nor presumption. I take heart, remembering how you lately commended Robertson for his boldness in speaking what he believed to be the

truth, even when it conflicted with generally received notions.

At various periods of my life, but chiefly at the beginning of my religious life, my mind was exercised on the doctrine of the Trinity; not as one difficult to believe, but hard to get hold of, intangible. I could not see exactly what I was to believe. Once I heard Dr. B—— preach a sermon on the subject, and he said in substance (I cannot remember the words) that we might naturally and reasonably have concluded that God's mode of existence would be different from anything we know, in such a sense, he would say, that we could form no conception of it from analogy. That struck me at the time as very deep, and for a time, quieted me. I have since then, seen something in Trench, deeper and more to the purpose, although it may be, unconsciously so. Robertson (F. W.) on this subject is to me very vague and unsatisfactory, Kingsley not much better.

How the idea that I am about, though imperfectly, to develop, first took root in my mind I can hardly tell. Very early in my religious life, it came to me by a sort of inspiration, not from

any book or word of man, of that I am certain; although I have since met with many passages in various authors, especially in Trench, which might, I thought, have suggested it, had I seen them before. The more I have studied the subject (with very limited means and capacities, it is true), the more I feel that what I have found is the truth of God; and if it be so, then why hide it in my own breast; and if not, let my error be enlightened.

If this be indeed, as I believe it is, a truth taught all through the Bible, although for a reason, dimly taught, if it be one which helps us to gain by analogy a clearer comprehension of the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity, if it throw light on many hitherto mysterious passages of Scripture, if it supply a great and craving need in the human heart, one that in the effort to fill it with husks, has been the fruitful source of error,—is it not worth considering by those who are better able to deal with it than I?

I can better, perhaps, preface by that “something deeper” from Trench to which I have referred. He says in one of his introductory chapters to the Notes on the Parables, page 18:

Study in the Book of Revelation 19

“Their power (that is of the analogies in the parables) lies in the harmony unconsciously felt by all men, and by deeper minds continually recognized and plainly perceived, between the natural and the spiritual worlds, so that analogies from the first are felt to be something more than illustrations, happily but yet arbitrarily chosen. They are arguments and may be alleged as witnesses, the world of nature being throughout a witness for the world of spirit, constituted for that very end. All lovers of truth readily acknowledge these mysterious harmonies and the force of the arguments derived from them. To them the things on earth are copies of the things in heaven. They know that the earthly tabernacle is made after the pattern of things seen in the Mount, and the question suggested by the angel in Milton is often forced upon their meditations:

“What if earth

Be but the shadow of heaven and things therein

Each to each other like, more than on earth is thought?”

Further on he says: “They belong to each other, the type and the thing typified, by an inward necessity; they were linked together long before by the law of a secret affinity.” And in a note:

“Out of a true sense of this has grown our use of the word likely. There is a confident expectation in the minds of men of the reappearance in higher spheres of the same laws and relations which they have recognized in lower: and thus that which is like is also likely or probable.”

In one of his Westminster sermons he says: “An ancient interpreter of Scripture has not scrupled to declare that there are in the book of Revelation (*The Apocalypse*) as many mysteries as there are words. True as these words are, taken with that natural limitation which of course they demand as applied to that wonderful book, they may be affirmed to be truer still in regard to the first three chapters of Genesis.” And again: “Revelation which means unveiling, an unveiling of God, of His character and being, must have mysteries, yea many and deep ones.”

In the first of these three chapters, at the 26th verse we find: “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion, etc.” Here we have first unity “God said,” next plurality (not yet Trinity) “let us make.” Then “let us make man” unity again, “and let them have dominion” plurality

again. Third "in our image, after our likeness." (See Trench's Synonyms.) Image implies more than mere resemblance, a copy after some existing pattern. This form of words is repeated thrice in the space of a few lines. Now wherein consists this image of God so emphasized? "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them." If you were hearing that verse for the first time, without any preconceived notions, could it fail to strike you that God is what can only be appropriately imaged by man in his dual state?

"Man is at once a summing-up of that which was before him, and a point of new departure. The saying, 'Let Us make man in Our image' (Gen. i. 26), is in no way opposed to the modern theory of our development (so far as the animal nature is concerned) out of lower forms of life." "In another verse, which by some is supposed to contain a different tradition, and has been hastily judged incompatible with the first, we read, 'The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.' (Gen. ii. 7.) Without disloyalty to these words, we may, in the light of modern discoveries, believe that the dust was already animated dust before the breathing spoken of, and ages may have

elapsed between the 'forming' and the breathing." (Mason, "Faith of the Gospel," pp. 81, 82.)

In fact, it makes even more strongly for our argument, if looking back to the primal life cell, you think of it as potentially man, and of God as then and there, making man "in His own image, male and female."¹

Says Christ "From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For *this* cause shall a man cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh; so that they are no more twain but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." For what cause? That they may eternally perpetuate, even though sinful and fallen, the image of God.²

But God is three in one. So has man also a Trinity, and it is significant that the first definite indication of the Trinity of both is conveyed in one word, the promise of the woman's seed who should bruise the serpent's head, Him who was the complement of both God and man.

If then, man, woman, and child together image God, apart, it would seem, they must image the

¹ See companion study, page 103, Section 4.

² See also Notes A. and D.

Study in the Book of Revelation 23

three Divine persons. This is as much as to say that Woman in her unfallen state was the earthly image of the Holy Spirit. And this, you will perceive, is the point to which all the foregoing tends. The great doctrine which I would set beside the Fatherhood and the Sonship is the Motherhood of the Holy Ghost. For the Bible is the revelation of God in His relations to man; and if it reveal to us not only a Father in heaven and an Elder Brother, but also a Divine Mother, is not this a precious revelation?

But let us see if the foregoing analogies be borne out by any others. First. In the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis we have the first mention of the Spirit, "And the Spirit of God moved (brooded) upon the face of the waters." Scott finds it strange that a word should be used which signifies the act of the mother bird brooding over her nest.

2d. "She shall be called woman because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man cleave, etc." (The words of God Himself.) "The Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father." "The Spirit which is of (or out of) God."

“Therefore,” wherefore? That they might perpetuate the image of God, not only as two in one, but in that peculiarity of relationship which is theologically termed “the procession of the Holy Ghost.”¹

“But though neither men nor angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by virtue of any such natural generation be called sons; yet one person we know, to whom the divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father as to the Son, which is the third person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that communication of the divine essence become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? . . . To this I answer, that the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word: but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication, the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession; and though everything which is begotten proceedeth, yet everything which proceedeth is not begotten. . . . *Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam; whereas Seth proceeding from the same person in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and*

¹ See also note C.

properly the son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production. . . . The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with Him, the Word proceedeth from the same person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other is not." (Pearson on the Creed. On "His Only Son," par. 45.) But this illustration is not original with Pearson. Methodius of Tyre (end of third century) says "the Spirit . . . proceeds, *like Eve from the side of Adam* . . . yet is consubstantial with the Father." (Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, etc.)

In the "Foundations of the Creed" by Bishop Goodwin, in the chapter on the Holy Ghost, I find the following: "One fears to express one's thoughts upon so solemn and difficult a subject, lest (as has not unfrequently happened) that which begins with apparently innocent speculation should develop into some ancient and condemned heresy. Few thoughts on old subjects in this period of the world's history are both new and true. Yet I have sometimes thought it possible that the being of the Holy Ghost might be as necessary a consequence of the being of the Father and that of the Son, as the existence of the third side of a triangle is the consequence of the other two, or the existence of a third resultant force is the conse-

quence of the coöperation of two forces on the same point. The procession of the third person of the Holy Trinity may be a divinely necessary procession: without confounding the persons or dividing the substance, the procession may perhaps be regarded as involved in the complete conception of the being of God: *in fact, if we could so far enter into the truth of that being, as to grasp the mystery of Father and Son, we should probably find that it was impossible not to include in the mystery the being of the Holy Ghost.*"

If you say you do not understand this story (of the creation of Eve) literally, I answer, neither do I so understand it. I believe it tells us "true historic facts, though the facts are presented to us partly under an allegorical shape. Under any other shape, we could not have received or understood them." (Mason.) In other words, I believe that there is a true sense in which, in the beginning woman proceeded from man, and what that sense is, natural science will perhaps at some not far-off day, reveal to us.

3d. In that wonderful third of John we read "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (And see the whole context.) Trench himself declares that "the earthly birth was preordained to typify the mystery of the heavenly." Why not go a step

further and say that the earthly mother was pre-ordained to typify the Heavenly Mother? Why should that which has been universally owned in every age as the holiest, highest, purest, most unselfish of earthly affections and relations, alone have nothing in common with heaven?

Trench does say, although in another connection, that men have at different times regarded the Holy Spirit in the light of a Mother, and cites one of the fathers. In this connection I may quote the traditional saying of Christ, "In the gospel according to the Hebrews the Saviour Himself says, 'Just now My Mother, the Holy Spirit took Me by one of My hairs and bore Me, away to the great mountain Thabor.'" Westcott says, in a note to his introduction to the Study of the Gospels, "This very singular saying, which is evidently of Hebrew origin, from the gender of Spirit (*Ruach*) is quoted several times." He then cites Origen and others.

St. Jerome in his commentary on Isaiah has the following: "According to their gospel which is written in Hebrew, and read by the Nazarenes, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended upon Him.
 . . . Besides in that gospel just mentioned we find

these things written: 'It came to pass, when the Lord ascended from the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon Him, and said to Him: My Son, in all the Prophets, I was waiting for Thy coming, and that I might rest on Thee, for Thou art My rest, Thou art My First-begotten, who shalt reign forever.' "

In his commentary on Micah vii. 6, we find: "Whoever reads the Book of Canticles, and understands by the Spouse of the Soul, the Word of God, and believes the gospel called According to the Hebrews, which we lately translated, in which the Saviour is introduced as saying: 'Just now, My Mother the Holy Spirit took Me by one of My hairs,' will not hesitate to say that the Word of God was born of the Spirit, and that the Soul which is the Spouse of the Word, has for the mother of its Spouse the Holy Spirit, who in the Hebrew language is spoken of in the feminine gender."

St. Jerome, whatever he may have thought of the Nazarenes, speaks quite respectfully of the Gospel of the Hebrews; but Pearson alludes very disrespectfully to the folly of the "Nazaræans" in "making the Spirit mother of Christ" "upon the authority of a pretended, but no, Scripture." (Pearson, Art. 3, Chap. 2, Note to par. 7.) It may be considered as proved that the Gospel to the Hebrews is not the original of St. Matthew. Dr. Salmon, however, says "it does not follow that it stands on no higher level than

Study in the Book of Revelation 29

the Apocryphal Gospels." It will be observed that I have not based any argument on any of these passages, but it would be strange, in such a paper, not to refer to them. It is manifest that the association of this doctrine of the Motherhood with the gross fables of the Gnostic heresy must have made the thought of it repugnant to the early fathers; but notwithstanding this, I cannot find anything set down as essential to belief which in any way conflicts with it.¹

4th. The peculiar characteristics of the Spirit.

"The Comforter." Not to cite any lesser authority, we have the word of God Himself for it, that the office of comforter is the mother's office. "Thus saith the Lord: As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you." (Isaiah lxvi. 18.)

St. James says "The Wisdom that is from above" that is the Divine Wisdom which Trench identifies with the Holy Spirit,² "is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits." Then patient, long suffering, striving, being grieved. All that we know of the Spirit is gentleness, tenderness,

¹ See also note E.

² As does also the author of the Book of Wisdom. See Note L.

patience, entreaty, but above all, holiness, purity, "the sanctifier." On this see (F. W.) Robertson. Of a similar list of graces he says: "These are graces essentially feminine. How were men to find expression for that idea which was working in them vague and beautiful, but wanting substance, the idea of the Divineness of what is pure above what is strong. Would you have them say simply, we had forgotten these things. Now they are revealed to us. Now we know that love and purity are as divine as power and reason? My brethren, it is not so that men worship, it is only so men think. They think about qualities, they worship persons. Worship must have a form: adoration finds a person; and if it cannot find one it will imagine one. Gentleness and purity are words for a philosopher, but a man whose heart wants something to adore will find for himself a gentle one, a pure one. You cannot adore, except a person." And from this, he deduces the origin of the worship of the Virgin Mary. He says the distinctive glory of Womanhood was found to consist in purity. (The Wisdom that is of God is "first pure.") Again he says, after a variety of premises, "It

follows that God has yet reserved for Womanhood a larger and more glorious field for her peculiar qualities and gifts, and that the truth contained in the Virgin Motherhood is unexhausted still." And he quotes the infidel French philosopher Comte as saying that "Woman worship is what the age wants. We want the glory of Woman to worship." Robertson says again, "There is one glory of Manhood and another glory of Womanhood." "Humanity has its two sides. Man and Woman, not Man alone, make up Humanity." (Now it was Man in the sense of Humanity that was made in God's image.) But Robertson thinks that the only safeguard against the idolatrous error of Virgin worship is a full recognition of the perfect Humanity of Christ. And Mrs. Jameson, in her book on the Madonna, says the same in substance, so that Robertson avers she got it from him. "In Christ," says Robertson, "both were glorified, Strength and Grace, Wisdom and Love, Courage and Purity, Divine Manliness and Divine Womanliness." And all this is true, but not I think, the whole truth, nor the truth that we want. No doubt Christ combined what we know of the

two Divine Persons, and as the Son of God, (not alone of the Father) so He should. But the human craving which found relief in the worship of the Virgin, was not so much, I think, for the deification of certain feminine virtues, as for a Divine Mother. Man that is born of Woman, and has drawn his first nourishment from her breast, looks up to heaven with an unspeakable longing to find there the same patient, inexhaustible, untiring tenderness, the mother-love, which if it do not image the Spirit's Love, is that anomalous thing, a copy without an original.

Kingsley in his book called "Yeast" which embodies so well the restless longing and expectancy that characterize the present age, expresses most vividly by the mouth of one of his characters this longing for a Divine Mother Love that drives him into the Romish church. "I am weak, would you have me say that I am strong? Would you have me try to be a Prometheus, while I am longing to be once more an infant on a mother's breast? Let me alone. I am a weary child who knows nothing, can do nothing except lose its way in arguings and reasonings, and 'find no end in wandering mazes lost.' Will

you reproach me, because when I see a soft cradle lying open for me, with a Virgin Mother's face smiling down all woman's love upon me, I long to crawl into it and sleep awhile. I want loving, indulgent sympathy," and so on.

5th. To quote from Trench again: "It will be my purpose to inquire whether we may not contemplate the relations of the Absolute Truth to the anterior religions of the world, in an aspect in which, instead of being secretly embarrassed by them, and hardly knowing how to deal with or to range them, we shall joyfully accept these presentiments of the truth as enhancing the greatness and glory of the truth itself, and as being, so far as they are allowed any weight, confirmations of it." Not to quote any further, the whole argument of his lectures on the Unconscious Prophecies of Heathendom is based on this idea. For as he says "it is not the presence of these resemblances which need perplex us, but rather their absence which would have been justly surprising, which would have been indeed most difficult to account for."

Mrs. Jameson says of the worship of the Madonna: "Everywhere it seems to have found

in the human heart some deep sympathy, deeper far than mere theological doctrine could reach, ready to accept it: and in every land the ground prepared for it in some already dominant idea of a mother goddess, chaste, beautiful and benign. As in the oldest Hebrew rites and Pagan superstitions men traced the promise of a coming Messiah, as the deliverers and kings of the Old Testament and even the demigods of heathendom (see Trench) became the accepted types of the person of Christ, so the Eve of the Mosaic History, (the Mother of all living), the Astarte of the Assyrians, 'The mooned Ashtaroth, Heaven's Queen and Mother both,' the Isis nursing Horus of the Egyptians, the Demeter and the Aphrodite of the Greeks, the Scythian Freya, have all been considered as types of a Divine Maternity, foreshadowing the Virgin Mother of Christ." On the three occasions when we hear Christ speak to, or of the Virgin,¹ He denies her the name of mother. ("Woman, what have I to do with thee?" "Woman, behold thy son!" "Who is

¹ There was another time, when He said, "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" (or "in My Father's House?")

my mother?") "The Madonna when she assumed to herself the characteristics of the great Diana of the Ephesians, at once the type of fertility and the goddess of chastity, became as the impersonation of motherhood, all beauty and graciousness, and at the same time, in virtue of her perpetual virginity, etc."

On the statue of Isis (one of the received "types of the Divine Maternity") were inscribed the strange words: "I am all that has been and all that shall be, and none among mortals has hitherto taken off my veil."

(Amun Re the Supreme Deity of the Egyptians, was at once his own father and mother.¹)

¹(From Arius the Libyan, page 84.) "In the original faith of all the primitive nations, the divine being is Father-mother, which is one dual God, and a son. If therefore, the Christian religion presents the idea of a spiritual dualism made a trilogy by the generation of a son, it maintains the very idea of the Deity, which is the core of all the primitive religions—Egyptian, Indian, Chinese, and, I think, Jewish also." But this author's idea of God is of "an almighty hermaphrodite spirit." "The divine being is spiritually hermaphrodite." This is not tenable for two reasons: 1st, a hermaphrodite in Nature is either a degenerate, or one of a low order of beings. 2d, Such an idea is the "confounding of persons" against which the Church protests. The idea of God which I wish to convey no more "confounds the persons" than it "divides the substance."

6th. May not the woman clothed with the sun (Rev. xii. 1) typify the Holy Spirit?

In his notes on the Parable of the Leaven, Trench says: "Is it only a part of the suitable machinery of the parable that it was a 'woman' who took the leaven, etc.? Or may we look for something more in it than this? A comparison with Luke xv. 8, the woman who had lost and found her piece of money, may suggest that the Divine Wisdom, the Holy Spirit which is the sanctifying power in humanity, may be meant. But if it be asked 'why as a woman?' to this it may be replied that the organ of the Spirit's working is the Church which evidently would be most fitly represented under this image." See now in his notes on the parable above referred to, of the lost piece of money: "The woman in this parable may perhaps be the Church; or if we say that by her is signified the Divine Wisdom which so often in Proverbs is described as seeking the salvation of men, and is here as elsewhere set forth as a person (Luke xi. 49) and not as an attribute, this will be no different view, for rather these two explanations flow into one, when we

keep in mind how the Church is the organ in and through which the Holy Spirit seeks for the lost. That the Church should be personified as a woman is only natural;¹ *nor has the thought of the Holy Ghost as a mother been at different times far from men's minds."*

But if this be the truth of God, why so long hidden or taught so indirectly? And why now revealed?²

1st. Hidden for the degradation and punishment of woman, as St. Paul almost says in words in that strange passage where he so insists on the veil or covering for the woman's head. As she would be "like the gods" so was her typical likeness hidden from all, even from herself, and so was she doubly "deceived, being in the transgression."

What has been said in the note on page 26 of the partly allegorical character of the story of Eve's procession from Adam applies as well (was originally intended by Doctor Mason to apply) to the story of the Fall. No one believes in a literal serpent, and few, in a literal fruit. All however is full of Divine suggestion. What was the nature of the sin which separated

¹ See Note O.

² See Notes to Sixth Article of the Summary.

Man from God? May it not have been in some way, a profanation of the Divine ideal, in which Woman was the original transgressor? And it is not necessary to assume that the punishment was arbitrary. God is the God of Nature and of Law, as well as of Providence. Woman's degradation through her own sin may have brought about naturally her own punishment, which would not be the less God's curse, because Nature's.¹

2d. There is another reason which I will develop in the sixth article of the summing up.

3d. We may say that when this truth began to dawn on men's minds, it was overshadowed and obscured by the rising worship of the Virgin. Then were given to the star-crowned queen two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness to the place prepared of God for her. And there she has remained hidden, ("but for a time").

The names and offices of the Holy Spirit were given to the Virgin. Especially the intercessory office, the central idea of Virgin worship.

"Not only him who asks
Thy bounty succors, but doth freely oft
Forerun the asking."

—*Cary's Dante. Hymn to the Virgin.*

¹ (See companion study, Section 8, on "The Seventh Commandment of Nature.") See also Note M.

“Sometimes Lady, ere men pray to thee
 Thou goest before in thy benignity,
 The light to us vouchsafing of thy prayers
 To be our guide.”
 — *Wordsworth's Chaucer.*

“Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us.” (Romans viii. 26.)

TITLES OF THE VIRGIN.

Our Lady of Comfort. (The Comforter.)
 Our Lady of Peace. (The very God of Peace sanctify you.)
 Our Lady of Wisdom. (The Divine Wisdom.)
 Mater Sapientiæ. (Wisdom of God.)
 Our Lady of Grace. (Spirit of Grace.)
 Mother of God. (The Scripture calls her “mother of Jesus,” and Elizabeth says, “the mother of my Lord” but not mother of God, and Christ Himself as I said before, on the only three occasions when we hear Him address her by name, does not give her the name of mother at all. But when He promises to send the Holy Spirit to His disciples, He says, “I will not leave you orphans.”)

The star-crowned queen has always been considered by the Romanists a type of the Virgin,¹ and in innumerable pictures she is represented in accordance with this idea.

In many others she is represented with the Book of Wisdom in her hands open as Mrs. Jameson tells us, at the seventh chapter, which contains the magnificent description of the Wisdom of God, supposed to refer prophetically to

¹ "Midmost, all glorious, shining serene,
Crowned with the star wreath, I see Heaven's Queen !

"Over earth to thee is given
Empire ! Let me in the free
Widespread tent of the blue heaven
See thy mystery.

"Aid in man's heart what thou of good,
Of tender thought and earnest,
Of holy love in his best mood
Up-breathed to thee, discernest !

"Virgin ! from all soil of sin
Virgin pure ! to thee we bow ;
Saintly mother ! Chosen queen !
One with the godlike Thou !

"To the heavenly heights as thou floatest away
Of the kingdoms eternal, to thee do we pray —
Thou that hast no peer !
Thou that art rich in grace ! Oh ! mercifully hear !"
—*Goethe's Faust, Second Part.*

the Virgin Mary. Now the author uses the names of Wisdom and the Holy Spirit interchangeably. "The things that are in heaven, who hath known and Thy counsel who hath searched out, except Thou give wisdom and send Thy Holy Spirit from above."¹

SUMMARY OF THE FOREGOING ARGUMENTS.

1st. We have first the Trinity of the Godhead.

God created the Heavens and the Earth. (Father.)

The Spirit brooded on the face of the waters. (Spirit.)

And God said, By Him (the Word) all things were made. (Son.)

Next the trinity of man made in the image of God.

In the image of God created He him. (Man.)

Male and female created He them.² (Woman.)

¹ See Note G.

² On page 87 of "Arius the Libyan" the same idea is developed from the same passage of Scripture. But this idea, all through the book is associated with the heresies of Arius, for which association there is no foundation in history. The *real* Arius taught that the Holy Ghost is a creature. He also taught that the Son was neither coeternal nor consubstantial with the Father.

And God blessed them and said, Be fruitful.
(Child.)

“I will say, boldly, my friends, that if one could find out the full meaning of those two words, mother and child, one would be the wisest philosopher on earth, and see deeper than all who have ever yet lived, into the secrets of this world of time which we can see, *and of the eternal world, which no man can see, save with the eyes of his reasonable soul.* And yet it is the most common, everyday sight. That only shows once more what I so often try to show you, that the most common, everyday things are the most wonderful. It shows us how that we are to despise nothing which God has made; above all, to despise nothing which belongs to *human nature, which is the likeness and image of God.* (Charles Kingsley, Sermon for Christmas Day, from Good News of God.)

2d. But we have more than this: more than a trinity of man made in the image of God. We have the Father and the Son; and these terms, if we are orthodox, we must accept not as mere accommodations, for that, says Trench, is Arian-

After this volume was in the publisher's hands, my attention was called to Edwin Markham's poem just out, "Song to the Divine Mother," with the footnote referring to Gen. i. 26, 27, for the confirmation of his assertion about the nature of God.

ism, "but we hold that the Son is truly Son, begotten of the Father."¹

"This then is the known confession of all men, that a son is nothing but another produced by his father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same divine essence by which He is God; and consequently He is of the same nature with Him, and therefore the perfect image and similitude of Him and therefore His proper Son. In human generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude: one in respect of the internal nature, the other in reference to the external form or figure. The former similitude is essential and necessary; it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son, not by nature a man." "The similitude then in which the propriety of generation is preserved is that which consisteth in the identity of nature: and this communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude." "The essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning He did commu-

¹ If such a doctrine as the Fatherhood of God has been lost to the Church for centuries, and only recently restored, who can wonder that the Motherhood should have remained so long an undiscovered mystery? Of the Fatherhood, Dr. John Watson says "it is inexcusable that the central theme of Jesus' teaching should have been ignored or minimized. This silence, from the date of the Greek Fathers to the arrival of the Broad Churchman, has been more than an omission; it has been a heresy."

nicate, being always Father as always God.” (Pearson on the Creed. See the paragraphs on “His Only Son,” from 40 to 45.)

Does not this create the strongest presumption from analogy? And are we not justified by Scripture in arguing from analogy here? For what is St. Paul’s reproach to the Gentiles who were without the written law? “The wrath of God is revealed against men who hold the truth in unrighteousness. Because that which may be known of God is manifested in them, for God hath showed it unto them, for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal Power and Godhead.”¹

3d. This doctrine contradicts so far as I know, nothing in Scripture, but much therein makes it probable by implication, and it explains and simplifies many things.²

4th. We find that the characteristics, offices, etc., of the Third Person of the Trinity are such as we are accustomed to consider distinctively feminine.

¹ See note H.

² See notes F, J, K and N.

5th. A sufficient and Scriptural reason may be assigned why this doctrine should have remained an unrevealed mystery.

6th. (This article is omitted.)

In the article omitted, the progressive character of Revelation, especially with reference to the Being of God, was suggested. The view taken was similar to that developed by St. Gregory Nazianzen in one of his discourses, which I had not then seen, and I now prefer to put the idea in his words rather than my own. I will premise by recalling the fact that even such fundamental doctrines as the Trinity, and the Personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost are not taught dogmatically in Holy Scripture, but had to be gathered by careful study and comparison of text with text; and were only gradually accepted by the Church, in their present form. "St. Gregory Nazianzen (fourth century) preached the Deity of the Spirit. He asks, 'But, why had the doctrine of the Spirit's Godhead been so little dwelt upon in earlier times?' He answers that it came last in the order of Divine Revelation. The Old Testament revealed the Father; in the New, the Son was manifested; each truth had to be firmly established in the minds of men before the next could follow. The Deity of the Holy Ghost *was one of those truths which the Church could not bear at first, but which she is now learning from the Divine Comforter Himself.*" (Smith and Wace.)

7th. The presumption from the primitive world religions, and the worship of the Virgin, as implying the craving in the human heart for a Divine motherhood.

8th. The argument from the procession of the Holy Ghost.

To the doctrines of the Deity and Personality of the Holy Ghost, the Church added that of the Procession from the Father. So far, the teaching of the Church about the Divine Spirit had developed rationally and naturally from the text of Holy Scripture. Then, there was a pause. It was felt that the next step was to be an important one. The Church was afraid of making a mistake. Of St. Hilary of Poitiers it is said, "His treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit shows how reluctantly Catholic writers of this period were forced into a minute examination of the mystery of the Spirit's Being." (Smith and Wace.)

Through what strange bias or warping the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was turned aside from its natural course into so extraordinary a deviation as that of the Procession from the Son, I am not sufficiently learned in the tendencies of the time to conjecture.

The Filioque, however, forms no part of the Creed of the Undivided Church, and was not adopted by any Ecumenical Council. I quote

from Bishop Leonard's Church Club Lecture (1893) on the First Council of Constantinople. After rehearsing the Creed as revised by that Council, he adds, "You will notice that this Creed announces belief in the fact that 'the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father,' and no mention is made 'of the Son.' This last expression which has crept into the Nicene Creed as it appears in our offices, is the famous 'Filioque.' It was first added to the Symbol, at a Spanish Provincial Council held at Toledo, A. D. 589. It has been the source of much dissension and difference, and was a principal cause for the sad separation of the Eastern and Western Churches. To-day it affects the relations of the Anglican Communion with the great Orthodox Eastern Church of Russia, Greece, and the Orient, and *would seem, to some, to mar the perfectness of our otherwise beautiful Confession of Faith.*"

To the above, I will only add that the argument of the Western Church, (that, if the Spirit proceeds from the essence of the Father, it must also proceed from the essence of the Son, because both have the same essence) proves just as well that, as the Son proceeds (by generation) from the essence of the Father, (Pearson) He must also proceed from the essence of the Spirit, since both have the same essence. Of course, the distinction between the Eternal, metaphysical procession and the temporal, double mission must be kept in mind. There is surely nothing strange in the thought that the Divine Son, having purchased by His

sacrifice the supreme gift for His infant Church, should send the Divine Mother on such errands of Heavenly Charity as are most fit for mothers to do, or that the Divine Mother should take of the things of Her Son, and show them to those for whom He died, or bring to their remembrance the words that He had said. I appeal to all mothers.

9th. The fact that the image of God is thus mirrored not only in man, but in miniature, through all living forms of creation, in the marriages of the flowers, in the invisible nuptials of the cryptogamia. Thus in the union of Two resides the mystery of creation, Two acting through One, (eternal generation of the Son,) the mediator not only between God and man, but between God and all things.

(The child, body and soul, is a part of both parents, yet neither loses anything, but both remain entire.)

12th. The Divine Wisdom is spoken of with the attributes of a woman.

13th. A negative argument. If God had intended to teach that the Holy Spirit is masculine in the same sense that the Father and the Son are, why not use a name which should convey dis-

tinctly that idea, instead of by the use of an uncertain or neuter word leaving the question open, so that the very Personality of the Spirit has been called in question? The Hebrew word has, at any rate, a feminine form, and the Greek is, I suppose, a translation of the Hebrew word. It is true that "in the Greek a masculine article or epithet is joined to the name (*Pneuma*) which is naturally of the neuter gender," and this, so far as I can discover, is the only fact which makes against my argument. What it amounts to, I am not scholar enough to know.

This is however true only with regard to the passages in St. John xiv. to xvi., in which the Holy Spirit is spoken of as "The Comforter." The author of "Arius the Libyan" refers to this difficulty, and thus disposes of it: "It is evident that in these places the only thing that can be meant by the 'Holy Ghost' and the 'Spirit of Truth' is the Paraclete, the Comforter; and while the Greek word for comforter is a noun of the masculine gender, the words 'Holy Ghost' and 'Spirit of Truth' still retain their neuter form, although put in apposition with it; and the pronouns 'he' and 'him' take their masculine form from the word comforter, and not from the words Holy Ghost and Spirit, which are always neuter, and express nothing as to sex."

It is not without a purpose that I have quoted so largely from the writings of men we both know and revere. I would show you how hitherward those great minds, the earnest, religious thinkers of our day have been tending, how some have stood on the very threshold of the Truth, how one, the master mind has had, as it were, his hand on the very veil of Isis, yet could not or durst not lift it. . . .

(The closing paragraphs of the letter are personal in character, and unsuitable for publication.)

NOTE A.

If our first parents had not fallen, the type would have been far more perfect with the union. (See Trench.) "These human relationships and this whole constitution of things earthly share in the shortcoming which cleaves to all that is of earth. Obnoxious to change, tainted with sin, shut in within brief limits by decay and death, they are often weak and temporary, where they have to set forth things strong and eternal; a sinful element is evidently mingled with them while they yet appear as symbols of what is

entirely pure and heavenly. They break down with the weight that is laid on them." "Somewhere or other man is a liar. He is false that is, to the divine idea which he was meant to embody, and fails to bring it out in all the fulness of its perfection. We have this treasure in earthen vessels."

NOTE B.—*Suggestions.*

The Sanctity of the Marriage Tie.

The First Ordinance of God. "Be Fruitful."

Christ's First Miracle performed at a Marriage Feast.

Adultery punished with death.

Christ enforces and makes more stringent the laws of marriage. "What therefore God hath joined, let not man put asunder."

Atheism, the infidelity of the French Revolution, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, all strike first at marriage.

NOTE C.

Although woman's subjection to man is a part of her punishment, there is a sense in which she

was made subordinate, for man was made first, then woman. And she was made for man, to be a help-meet for man, when both were yet unfallen. And the subordination of the child to the parent is strongly insisted on all through Scripture.

Now we find that the Spirit is "sent" and "proceedeth" and is of God. And in a still more emphatic sense, the Son is sent. But nothing of the kind is ever affirmed of the Father. No, "The Father is greater than I." "The Son also Himself shall be subject, that God may be all in all." "The head of Christ is God."

The man, the father, the husband, is head of the household, as husband in one sense and degree, as father in another and more emphatic sense and greater degree. It is a superiority of relation and position, not of character nor of nature.

NOTE D.

Swedenborg's idea of marriage in heaven, "The marriage of minds." The two are re-

garded as one angel. Yet he did not hold the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Since in the One God there are three distinct persons, we have a pledge that however perfect the future union of souls, the identity of each will not be lost.

Kingsley has something on the same subject in "Yeast." Argemone says: "Oh, the angelic life is single." Lancelot "Who told you this?" She quoted the stock text of course. "In heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels." "As the tree falls so it lies, and God forbid that those who have been true lovers on earth should contract new marriages in the next world. Love is eternal. And how do we know that these angels as we call them, may not be united in pairs by some marriage bond infinitely more perfect than any we can dream of on earth?" (Yeast.)

NOTE E.

In the angel's address to Mary, the work of both Father and Spirit in the human birth of Christ is indicated. "The Holy Ghost shall

come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."

The Father is "The Highest."

NOTE F.—*On Ephesians v. 31.*

It is true that St. Paul quotes this passage in a different connection, and uses it to illustrate Christ's relation to the Church.

But his phraseology is peculiar and seems to imply that he here uses it in a secondary sense. For after saying "A man shall be joined to his wife and they two shall be one flesh," he adds "This is a great mystery, *but* I speak concerning Christ and the Church." As if he would say, "This oneness of two typifies a great mystery, but at present, I use it in a restricted sense to illustrate the relation between Christ and the Church." If this be far-fetched, then what is the meaning of "but" in this connection?

NOTE G.—*On the Honorableness of Marriage.*

The mother of our Lord was a married woman,

not indeed when the angel came to her, but even then espoused, and formally married at the time of his birth, and if we are willing to take the honest and fair interpretation of the simple text of Scripture, she was afterward truly the wife of Joseph and mother of his children. For the angel says to him, Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife. And afterward we read that "he knew her not until she had brought forth her firstborn son," and again we read of the mother and brothers and sisters of our Lord.

Do not think that in the foregoing pages I meant to cast any slight on the mother of the Lord. How should I, when God pronounced her by His angel "Blessed among women"? But would not her righteous soul be more vexed than any other, could she know of the idolatrous honors that have been paid her?

In her indeed, more than in any other, the pure type reappears, woman as she rose pure and stainless under the hand of her Maker. Woman is "saved in child-bearing," it is as the mother that she reasserts herself the type of the Divine, and above all, in her who was "blessed among women."

NOTE H.—*On Romans i. 18, et seq.*

The argument of St. Paul is very peculiar, in its premises, suite, and conclusions. The heathen are inexcusable because they held the truth in unrighteousness, because God was manifest in them, because the invisible things of God were clearly shown by the things that were made; these things he restricts to two, His Eternal Power and Godhead. Now in the first of Genesis there are two respects in which man appears to be made in God's image, "in the image of God male and female," and "in the image of God with dominion" (let them have dominion over the creatures), the power and Godhead thus being clearly shown by the things that were made. But man was made in the image of God first in his mode of existence, one yet three; next in his attributes, as in the Westminster catechism it is put, "in knowledge, righteousness and holiness." This is implied, for God's work is all very good, the image and likeness was one that satisfied the Divine original. And it is perhaps, more perfect than we are accustomed to consider it, even repeating so far as the finite can repeat the infinite, those attributes of God which in their full-

est sense, belong only to Him. Omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, are God's alone. Yet who, especially in these latter days, would dare to limit the capacities of man's mind, even fallen as he is. Robertson holds that it was the perfection and truthfulness of Christ's humanity that enabled him to read men's minds as he did. Who shall say what we might do, if we were true to the Divine idea!

At all events, it is necessary to St. Paul's argument that men should be able to argue from the finite to the infinite. But, he says, although they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, but they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the image of corruptible man, and birds and beasts, and creeping things; they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped the creature more than the Creator. They reversed the natural order, and instead of trying to raise themselves to realize the Divine idea, they degraded the idea of God, and made Him like their sinful selves. And herein lies the force of the argument and the appropriateness of their punishment. By this folly and wickedness, they so completely lost the image of God, that

they were given up, and gave themselves up to nameless and unnatural lusts. (See Romans i. 24-27.)

Note J. has been omitted. But see note which follows.

On St. John iii. 5, and Titus iii. 5.—“All the circumstances of the natural birth were preordained to typify the heavenly.”—*Trench.*

For a child to be born, implies first, the communication of life, a sort of creative act; then a process by which that life is nourished and developed. And so, in the spiritual birth, there is the same sequence. In common theological parlance, the word “regeneration” covers both, but in the only place in Scripture where the word (*palingenesia*) is used of the soul, it is evidently restricted to the creative act, as set forth by baptism, “The washing of regeneration;” the gradual process is expressed there, by the words “renewal of the Holy Ghost.” In regeneration, we are not only “born of the Spirit” but “begotten of God” (1 John v. 1, 4, 18, iii. 9, iv. 7; James i. 18), begotten by a creative act of sovereign will, but born of the Spirit by the gradual process of renewal. So that born of water and of the Spirit would express both.

And herein lies the peculiar fitness of baptism to set forth the creative act, that as by the “corruptible seed” of man, our natures are transmitted impure from father to son, so from the “incorruptible seed”

of God (1 Peter i. 23) is generated a new and pure principle of Divine life which ultimately exterminates the other. And the pure water of baptism fitly typifies this purifying, vivifying, "incorruptible seed."

So that the verse would say, if we would receive it, "born of the Father and the Spirit." Does not this throw some light on the mysterious verse about the three witnesses, "The Spirit, the Water, and the Blood"?

And as for repentance and renewal, they are only visible effects of divine causes at work. And what is, according to Christ, the central idea of true repentance? Is it not this, "I will arise, and go to my Father"? For in the very act by which we become the sons of God, He communicates the power to recognize that relationship. And this power of recognition is the witness which the Spirit bears that we are indeed the children of God.

"The cradle of the Lord's newborn
Where deeply lurks the living beam
Lit in the glad baptismal morn.
But into keen, enduring flame
It may not burst, till Heavenly Love
Have o'er it spread, in Christ's dear Name
The pinions of His brooding Dove."
—*Keble. Lyra Innocentium.*

NOTE K.—*On the Unpardonable Sin.*
Those glorious works of beneficence which

Christ wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit, the wicked Pharisees accused Him of doing by the indwelling power of "an unclean spirit." Their sin thus took the form of a peculiar and deadly insult to the Divine purity of the Sacred Third Person of the Trinity. If we consider that this deadliest insult was offered to the person of the Divine Mother of God, we can better understand why it should be the one sin for which there can be no forgiveness here or hereafter. For God has implanted such a corresponding feeling in the breast of man, that even on earth, according to man's code of honor, the one unpardonable sin is an aspersion on the purity of wife or mother.

NOTE L.—*On the 7th Chapter of the Book of Wisdom.*

From Westcott's article on the Book of Wisdom in Smith & Wace's Dictionary. "The magnificent description of Wisdom, Chapter vii. 22 to viii. 1, must rank among the noblest passages of human eloquence, and it would perhaps be impossible to point out any piece of equal

length in the remains of classical antiquity more pregnant with noble thoughts or more rich in expressive phraseology." "In the book of Proverbs, Wisdom is represented as present with God before and during the creation of the world. In the book of Wisdom, Wisdom is identified with the Holy Ghost."

"It seems indeed impossible to study the book dispassionately and not feel that it forms one of the last links in the chain of providential connection between the Old and New Covenants. It would not be easy to find elsewhere any pre-Christian view of religion equally wide, sustained, and definite." And he also says that this book with the rest of the Apocrypha has been by the English Church strangely neglected. There is no doubt that St. Paul repeatedly quotes from it although he does not name it, and it contains a singularly detailed prophecy of Christ's martyrdom.

Book of Wisdom, chapter vii. 7: "I called upon God and the Spirit of Wisdom came unto me. 10. I loved her above health and beauty

and chose to have her instead of light, for the light that cometh from her never goeth out. 11. All good things came to me together with her. 12. And I knew not that she was the mother of them.

“24. Wisdom is more moving than any motion. She passeth and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness. 25. For she is the breath (Spirit) of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty. 26-29. She is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of His goodness. And being but One, she can do all things, and remaining in herself she maketh all things new: and in all ages, entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God and prophets. For God loveth none but him that dwelleth with Wisdom. For she is more beautiful than the sun and above all the order of the stars: being compared with the light she is found before it.

“Chapter viii. 3, 4. In that she is conversant with God she magnifieth her nobility: yea, the Lord of all things himself loved her. For she is privy to the mysteries of the knowledge of God,

and a lover of His words. 17. Now when I considered these things in myself and pondered them, how that to be allied unto Wisdom is immortality . . . 18 . . . I went about seeking how to take her to me. . . . 21. Nevertheless when I perceived that I could not otherwise obtain her, except God gave her to me, . . . I prayed unto the Lord and besought Him and with my whole heart I said, (Chapter ix. 1) O God of my fathers and Lord of mercy, who hast made all things with Thy word, 4. Give me Wisdom that sitteth by Thy throne, and reject me not from among Thy children. 8-10. Thou hast commanded me to build a temple upon Thy holy mount, and an altar in the city wherein Thou dwellest, a resemblance of the holy tabernacle which Thou hast prepared from the beginning. And Wisdom was with Thee which knoweth Thy works and was present when Thou madest the world, and knew what was acceptable in Thy sight and right in Thy commandments. O send her out of Thy holy heavens and from the throne of Thy glory. 16, 17. The things that are in Heaven who hath searched out, and Thy counsel who hath

known, except Thou give Wisdom and send Thy Holy Spirit from above."

NOTE M.—*On 1 Corinthians xi. 10 and the context.*

Why must a woman be veiled? "Because of the angels." That is a strange answer. What does it mean? What does a veil mean? Something hidden—covered, "revelation is unveiling." What is there of woman that is hidden of which this veil is a symbol? Her typical likeness to the Holy Spirit. From man, for her sin, for in the Fall she was far the guiltier of the two, her likeness to God is hidden, to him she is but the glory of man. She is subject to man. Man alone is the image and "glory of God." To him then, her veil has no profound meaning, and therefore this passage has always remained a mystery. But the angels,—they know why,—they know that as she would be like "the gods," so by a stern but just decree, her typical and true likeness is hidden from all, even from herself, and so she is doubly "deceived, being in the transgression." Her curse was threefold. She

Study in the Book of Revelation 65

was cursed as mother and cursed as wife, and these are plain denunciations, and terribly have they been fulfilled. In all the long misery of pregnancy, in the agonies and deadly perils of childbirth, she drees her curse as mother. In her world-wide humiliation she has suffered the curse of subjection as wife, although where the Cross of Christ is set up, that curse has been mercifully lightened.

But the third curse is more mysterious, and doubtless intentionally so, for to have made it plainer would have made it void. "Thy desire shall be to thy husband." . . . What was the woman's desire? There was something she had desired so ardently as to risk death for it. It was to be "as the gods," "to be wise." She who was made in the image of "The Wisdom of God" was not content with that high honor, but would exalt herself by forbidden means. So she was struck down from her height, and the desire of her heart was given to her husband. He alone has been regarded as the image of God. . . .

In commenting on verses 7, 8, "He (the man) is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the

glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman but the woman is of the man." Professor Lias, (Camb. Comm.) tells us, this does not mean that woman is in no sense to be regarded as the image and glory of God, but that man is so immediately, she mediately, through man. In other words, through her procession from Adam, she is the image of God the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth from the Father.

NOTE N.—*On Matthew xix. 11.*

All men cannot receive this saying, etc.
. . . The whole character of the observation and the context seems to imply that the words "this saying" refer to Christ's declaration of the sanctity and indissolubility of marriage as a holy ordinance of God, and so He would say: All men are not capable of appreciating this view of the sacredness of marriage. For some are incapacitated by birth or accident, and some even are so mistaken as to think of pleasing God by a voluntary and forced celibacy, so making themselves virtually or literally (as some have done) eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. And it is well known that it was just the monks of the Middle Ages who were most incapable of

appreciating the "spiritual beauty of marriage." They were "not able to receive" this teaching of Christ.¹

NOTE O.

As everything in the Book of Nature and the Bible, the written and unwritten books of God, leads constantly from the lower to the higher and from the higher still up to the highest,—I believe that the collective church, the bride, white robed and sanctified and wedded to Christ, is the grand and final type of the Holy Spirit; and that those parables of the leaven and lost piece of money, and the vision of the star-crowned queen are meant to lead us to this. "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come!"

¹ The Church of Rome has ever taken a false, degrading, and unscriptural view of marriage.

Study in the Book of Nature

“ The sense-world shadows forth the spirit world.
These shadow pictures are vouchsafed to man,
That he, thereby, the Infinite may interpret.”

—PERSIAN MYSTICAL POEM.

“ This visible world is but a picture of the invisible.”
—SIR THOMAS BROWNE, “Religio Medici.”

To
My Father and Mother
In Loving Memory
Of Home

Preface to the Study from Nature

FOR the major idea which I have endeavored to elucidate in this Nature Study, I make no claim whatever to originality. It was given me by my mother, to whom it came in early life, a vision of beauty and mystery, in whose soul it grew and took shape through the days of her young wifehood and motherhood, by whom it has been treasured ever since, until the present time, when we have judged that men will be ready to discuss it with calm and pure hearts, for only such can hope to see God.

If there be anything original in the demonstration, it will be found in the idea of referring the question at issue to the teachings of Nature, and in the particular method of so doing.

Ruskin seems to have had a very poor opinion of the theological knowledge of the young women of England in his day, and a great aversion to the idea of their trying to remedy the deficiency. It may be seriously doubted whether

it could be said to their children at the present day, "You probably know less about God" "than any poor little red, black, or blue savage running wild in the pestilent woods, or naked on the hot sands of the earth." However this may be, and in spite of these sage contra-evolutionary dictums, I am persuaded that the higher truth lies in another dictum, that this is Life Eternal, to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, and yet another, that he who seeks shall find. May it not be that because he did not seek in the faith of finding, this greatest critic of human art failed utterly to see and know the Artist in the greatest of all works of art, Nature?

By years of serious scientific training and busy life among men, I have been led to the line of thought followed in this study; and among the writers for whose works I am most grateful (although I do not for a moment claim that there was any thought of leading up to this) I should not fail to mention particularly Mr. Darwin, and the Duke of Argyll, and later, Dr. John Fiske, Dr. Lyman Abbott, the late Professor Rider, Dr. George A. Piersol, Dr. B. C. Hirst, Dr. A. J.

Mason, and Prof. Henry Drummond. To Mr. Drummond, I am indebted not alone for his works, but for the almost ideal life which he lived and so strongly have I felt his personal influence, and so much have I lived with his thoughts, (I never had the pleasure of meeting him otherwise) that I have quoted somewhat from them in these pages. I am persuaded that Mr. Drummond believed or was on the threshold of believing as I do of the nature of God, and I find in his works many passages in which he seems to come to a point but one removed from saying in substance what I have tried to say here. Had he lived, I think he would have said it, and said it better.

Finally, let me say that I have confined my attention here to the study of this question through Nature alone, in order to hear what she might have to tell me; but in so doing, I acknowledge the higher authority of the book of Revelation over that of my interpretation of the book of Nature. And perhaps I can best express this in saying that I believe that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God.

W. H. J.

Philadelphia, November 29, 1900.

I

The Artist, his Ideal, and his Work

THE STANDPOINT

It has many times proved a recreation, as well as my appreciated privilege, to watch from the vantage ground of intimacy, the conception and creation through years, of a great American artist's greatest works. There was an ever-present mind, perhaps unsurpassed in its power of grasping facts, and of forming and holding ideals. No mere appreciation of the appearance of things, but a knowledge of their actuality. Not an eye for the mere sparkling azure of the sea, but a grand soul for the ocean's trackless wastes and the depths that made it blue; an experience of its storms and its calms, years spent by its side, months spent on its heaving bosom, days spent in studying its birth and life, its works and the laws by which it works. Again, not an eye

alone for highly colored canyons and their deeply buried boiling streams; but time spent by their side and in their depths, knowledge of their rocks and the order and process of their formation, of their trees and the classification and nature of their foliation, of the birds and beasts that inhabit the forest depths and the mountain wilds. And above all, and in keeping with all, a great love for all.

What the artist painted was never exactly what his eyes saw; it was an ideal compounded of this, and of what he knew, felt, thought, and loved. It was his ideal of truth, truth as apprehended and assimilated by him, the truth that was in, and of him.

When the ideal was formed, then, and not till then, followed the work.—A great white canvas, an indefinite outline, rough indeed, and all but meaningless, then months spent in the laying of fundamental or base colors, and those which will later on, give body and tone to that which is to follow. Massive forms appear, and here and there, some details are suggested and imperfectly worked out, and of these, some are monstrosities, or but hints of later things, and are

themselves blotted out. Large patches of green will now appear as forests of pine or oak, and will prove in keeping with great piles of red sandstone or other formation. A harmony has appeared, a certain reason in things. More details and softer colors, and more harmony and more; and higher yet, a train or trend of thought, and in it, mind. Details everywhere, mind everywhere. Perhaps a great white cross upon an everlasting rock and a solitary human figure, his body in the valley, his eyes on the mountain heights; or the shadow of an eagle on a desert place, a carcass where no life is.

The work is finished, the artist is in it, if we can see him. We read his ideals as best we may, through his creations, through them also we read his nature, for the ideal is of him. Through the first work we may see love in him, and a looking to the heights;—through the other, that where there is no life and progress, there the eagles will be gathered.

Through the pages to follow, I would have you keep this simile constantly in mind, as it “but speaks an imaged life,” and represents better than any other that suggests itself to me, the

greatest work of art, its ideals which are all truth and beauty and love, and the artist, God.

Nature, as we know it, seems to be indeed, the greatest work of art, so both science and philosophy are inclining to think. They do not indeed, put it just in this way ; but, discovering through Nature and Mind great ideals of truth, beauty, wisdom, purity, and love, they say in other words the same thing, namely that "All things come of Thee, and of Thine own have we given Thee!" that things were made for the ideal's sake, and whether all else were made for man or not, certainly man and all else were made for a revelation or manifestation of God. "He who runs may read."

The relationship which exists between the human artist and his work is this: the mind makes the ideal, which is either wholly derived from within, or is a compound of ideas from within, and of certain ideas and groups of ideas derived from without. The ideal is therefore partially, at least, limited by the forming mind. It can never be greater than the artist, unless he goes outside himself for part of it. This he usually does, so that, in some respects, it will be

greater than himself. The work is the image of the ideal, and is therefore also limited by the mind. In the case of God and Nature, there is this difference from the above. Whether God be finite or infinite, which is no longer an open question, His ideals are wholly from within the limits of His mind. He could not have gone outside of Himself for them, since there was no without. And the work is the image of the ideal, and therefore also within the compass, if we may so speak, of His mind.

In using the words "limit" and "compass" of infinite mind, I mean, of course, derived wholly from within it. The human artist is interpreting another mind's ideas, which he makes his own ideals. The closer he reads the ideas, the higher and truer will be his ideals. The man who can get no further than lewd ballet girls will hardly have such ideals as we believe we find in the works of Burne-Jones and Hofmann. But in God, are His own ideals. Evidently therefore, there is inexpressibly more of God in His work than of the artist in his.

God's ideals are in Himself, they are also ideals representing His mind, existing in it. The progress repre-

sented in the work, and which ever makes toward the ideals, and which has, in turn, its own ideals, may prove eternal in time, an eternal approach to Himself, or rather to the ideals which are in Him,—the perfect one, perfect in the sense here, of embracing all ideals.

Also, if His life is the highest or best,—perfect in this somewhat different sense, (and it is hardly conceivable that it should be otherwise than perfect in every applicable sense) our lives which are making toward His ideals, must also be tending toward the best, and we are ever more and more divine.

In the beginning God stretched before the great white throne a canvas from the four corners of endlessness, and He called the canvas Space; and He raised His hand and began to work, and Time began. And in the deep recesses of time, there was a universe upon the canvas, and it was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of all; and there was no light nor life there. And in the course of ages, foundations were laid, and upon them, seas and floods appeared, and light appeared above and life within, and these were the signs of great ideals, and the ideals were of God. And we say that God is Light, and He is Life.

And monstrosities appeared, big in body and

without reason, and they died, for there was nothing in them to live.

And as time grew older, a wonder appeared upon the canvas, and the wonder was mankind,—men, women, and children,—and they had been from the beginning of life as the beasts, and later had reason and wisdom, and knew that they were the image of an ideal and the ideal was God. And Reason and Wisdom were God. And still later, Love was manifested upon and within the work, and it was called God, for it was God, and embraced all other ideals.

And in these still later times, other ideals have manifested themselves, and some are known and others are thought to be of the nature of God. Of these, are work itself, and progress, liberty, equality of all men, that is of all mankind, of men and women, of children and parents, who are equal as God is equal, free as God is free, in the liberty of truth. And there are many others, and among them, two which are one, and which seem to me to reach farther and more thoroughly to permeate the work than any other except Love itself, and these are the ideas of marriage and of the unity of the family.

In the following pages will you consider with me, in the unfeigned reverence of children for their parents, and in the name of the truth which is to make us free, whether or not there may be anything, and what it may be in the Divine nature which stands as the eternal prototype and *raison d'être* of those things which permeate all life as we know it, of the holiest relationships which exist among men, and of two of those goals toward which our physical, mental, and spiritual evolution are making,—pure marriage, and the family unity which will come of perfect love.

In discussing this lofty theme, let us realize what is our standpoint and what are our vantage grounds. Are we not ourselves forming figures upon that great canvas, and central figures too? Much around us is in more detail than we. Our drapery is largely painted in, but our faces are somewhat lacking in soul, as the artist says. Underneath and around us we have all history, from the stretching of the canvas, before we were so much as sketched in, until the present day. And we have the great secret at last revealed in the past century, but working through

all the ages. We read in this the greater future. And in all we read, as we may, the artist's mind, his nature, his methods, and the trend¹ of his work,—himself, in short, for he is in all.

In all the foregoing I have spoken much of God, nor have I thought it necessary or within the scope of this discussion to prove His existence. In a nature discussion, if I may so call this, it matters not what name we give to that which I have called God. Our name will not affect His identity. Without wishing to follow in the steps of a class of writers who occasionally and abruptly, would sweep from the board, so to speak, with one move of a pawn a plurality of chessmen, including perhaps a king or so; I would state that the existence of God is, in the present day, acknowledged by thinking men who occasionally lift their eyes from the stage of their microscope, and by many men who do not. And if there be others who yet do not see, I

¹ I shall make some use of this word, trend. It is not prominent in recent scientific literature, and yet perhaps no other expresses so well the method by which through evolution we read from the past into the future. It suits my purpose, and moreover, is short, means something, and that, exactly what it says.

would say to these that in Mr. Fiske's "Through Nature to God," I have found some natural reasons which I can neither excel nor so well repeat, for believing in the existence of both God and men.

By God's ideals, I mean whatsoever there may be in God which stands as prototype to Nature.

And by Nature, I mean what others mean, when speaking in the broadest sense of the word, namely that which conforms to God's laws.

II

Of Analogies

Consider the Lilies !

THERE are several methods by which we attempt to demonstrate truths to each other, and of these, two are in most frequent requisition, namely, that by pure logic, and that by pertinent analogies.

If the former be applicable to a point in question, it is the more convincing, indeed its verdict is final. But its use is absolutely conditional on knowledge or admission of all the facts in the case. Otherwise, it is never final, and seldom to be trusted, the danger of error, through some slight technical or verbal flaws, being altogether too great. There are some truths which could not be proved by any human language. We have but to read any history of philosophy to be aware that these statements are true.

The method by analogy, on the other hand, if the analogies be reasonable, though its verdict is never final, is often convincing, whether all, or even most of the facts in the question under discussion be known or not. It is for the above reasons that argument by analogy is the method of Nature students and scientists in general, the world over, and can be abandoned by such, only when discussing subjects of which the limits are clearly seen and presumably understood.

I would not for one moment seem to fail in appreciation of the human intellect, the powers and glory of which can hardly be overestimated; but that it has a limit, it would be foolishness to deny, and its limit of logical demonstrative power is within its grasp of facts. It would seem as if, above all other fields, we might best apply pure logic to pure philosophy; and yet we find among philosophers every grade, for instance, of idealist, from the all but materialist through Leibnitz with his monads, and Berkeley with his archetypes, to the more modern idealism of Herman Lotye and the mysticisms of Prof. T. H. Green's neo-Hegelian doctrines; and we have many of their representatives to-day and neither were

these men, nor are their followers, of mean mind power. No two philosophies have ever been shown to be in perfect agreement. They all appear movable quantities, both as to time progressive and time present. What then? Are we to give over trusting in our mental powers, and sit down to wait until we have them larger? That would be despair indeed, for in the light of what we know of evolution's requirements for progress, we should thus sit, until we became monads once again.

Let us rather admit that, though every fact from the simplest to the most involved be doubtless capable of logical demonstration, such proofs are almost without exception, not as yet, for us; that neither we are fixed quantities, nor are our surroundings; that we live and move in an overlapping series of ascending progresses, that we can no more prove by logic the more involved facts of Nature and its greater source, than we can put together a watch, no part of which is, as yet, complete,¹ or photograph the finished cathe-

¹ One might put it partly together and gain the trend of the unfinished parts, and the probable function of the whole, but one could not dogmatize about the matter.

dral of St. John the Divine, while yet it is in process of building.

Let us reason as honestly as is in us, and as reasonably as our powers allow, and neither be surprised nor disappointed that others from different standpoints, do not see exactly as we do. If there be truth in what we teach, it will be established in time, and if there be no truth, let us thank God from the bottom of our hearts, that it will soon die.

In the following discussion I purpose to use chiefly the method of argument by analogy. We are to deal with a question of Nature, and this is the only method that seems to me to apply to such, as viewed by the human or any other finite intellect. Nature is progressive, we are progressive, both as individuals and as a race. We have not all the facts by a very wide margin and indeed are only beginning to classify those we have. Nature is a life, not a philosophy, and its arguments cannot be, for us, fixtures. Could they become so, we should have reason to despair, since stagnation would be our portion.

Analogy is the argument of science; the very word calls attention to this fact. It is the argument of reaching out, of progress—in chemistry, physics, economics, sociology, law, medicine, and theology. These are movable quantities, as can be shown from that so-called fixed science, chemistry. There was a time when there were supposed to be but four elementary substances, earth, air, fire and water. When I was a college student, there were some sixty-eight elements clearly demonstrated to be such, with seven or eight more still in doubt. And it is now beginning to look as if there might be but one element after all, and that perhaps a non-condensed form of all the formerly so-called elements, named by chemists “protyle.” What are we to think? What of logical proofs based on such movable foundations as these?

Boyle and Lavoisier were those to insist that the elements were independent in their nature and ultimate. There are some chemists, however, who propose the view that the elements consist of one fundamental matter in various stages of condensation, and that the stage is dependent on the temperature, the higher the temperature the less being the condensation. In 1815

Prout suggested that this fundamental matter was hydrogen, but the suggestion was shown to be inaccurate by the work of Stas and others. At present the fundamental matter, called "Protyle," without any further attempt being made to characterize it, is, so to speak, placed lower down in the scale than hydrogen which is itself regarded as protyle in a definite advanced stage of transition. Crookes regards all elements as having been gradually evolved from this protyle; the heavier elements, such as bismuth, thorium and uranium being the younger or more recent species; the lighter elements, such as lithium, boron, etc., being the older.¹

Again,—anatomy is a fixed science, we say. There was a time when muscle, bone, fat, etc., were anatomical units to argue from, then there were cells of homogeneous protoplasm, then these cells had nuclei, then again nucleoli, then there were polar bodies, chromatin, centrosomes, and a host more of parts,—and now a whole series of most complicated and absorbingly interesting processes have their seat within these protoplasmic once-called units.

A second reason for the adoption of this

¹(Information supplied through the courtesy of Dr. John Marshall.)

method lies in the fact of its applicability to generalizations. This follows from what I have already said of it. The more we try to include, and the larger our problem, the less trustworthy is the other method. Such generalizers as Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, Drummond, Fiske, and a host of others have employed it with such success and power to convince, as makes it unnecessary for me to do more than instance their work.

And thirdly, it does not depend for its life on dim shades of words and hair-breadths of interpretation. In it, we do not arrange our blocks as some other children do, in serpentine chains, so that, if one falls, the whole is lost. We rather range them side by side, and though one or a dozen fall, the truth may remain.

Fourthly, it is the method that in these latter days, is proving the persuasive argument par excellence. Is there any one who will stake his all on one kind of idealism to the exclusion of all others? I, for one, will not. Or will any one be willing to live on the conclusions of that marvelous logician, Mr. Sidgewick, as set forth in the *Methods of Ethics*? I cannot live by

them, but I can live by a good and reasonable analogy. I can see light and live by the lilies and the sparrows.

Finally, if an argument by analogy be not true, or only partly so, it will soon betray itself. If the method be used incorrectly or too closely, the fact will soon be revealed by honest criticism, and whatever truth there may be in it will not be lost by sifting. Mr. Drummond used the method in both of his Nature books; in the second, almost without error, in the first, with some mistakes in the matter of overstretched analogies. It is recorded in his biography by G. A. Smith, p. 154, et seq., that in later years Drummond recognized these fallacies, and freely acknowledged them, and said in 1890, "I would write the book differently if I were to do it again, etc.," yet the truth in the book remains, and some of its inspiring analogies will remain with us forever.

That there is truth and much truth in what I purpose to discuss in this study, I have no manner of doubt. And I earnestly desire to know that others see the same light as I, on the path that we shall follow together. Yet, though I

believe, I desire to prove nothing. If there be truth in what I glean, and offer, you will see it. You will know it as you always know truth, by its beauty, by its simplicity, its reasonableness and its adaptability, by its persuasiveness, its universality, and by your willingness to trust it. You will know it, because it is truth, and God is Truth, and you are an image. We have, thanks to God and His army of seekers, given up, or nearly so, cramming our views down other people's throats as truth. As through republican ideals we are learning slowly to be, each and every one of us, a good governor, so by seeking each for himself, we shall learn together to know truth, which is freedom.

III

Life and its Factors

ORGANIC life has been defined by Mr. Lewes ("History of Philosophy," p. 80) as the "con-nexus of the organic activities," and though there have appeared many attempts to be more definitive, I know of no result that is less involved or more satisfactory than this one. It seems to be a true definition as far as it goes.

Of these activities of organic life, it is well known that there are two which seem to embrace all others, and to be essential to the existence of all such life, and these are nutrition and reproduction. And these two factors are shown by Mr. Drummond¹ ("The Ascent of Man," p. 220, et seq.) to have been intimately associated with, and bound respectively to the two great labors

¹ I have given in the preface my reasons and my apology for quoting somewhat frequently and at some length from the writings of Mr. Drummond, and of one or two others.

of evolution, namely, the struggle for life, and the struggle for the life of others. The writer then goes on to show that the exercise of these two activities "in plants, and largely in animals, sums up the work of life. The object of Nutrition is to secure the life of the individual; the object of Reproduction is to secure the life of the Species. These two objects are thus wholly different. The first has a purely personal end; its attention is turned inwards; it exists only for the present. The second in a greater or less degree is impersonal; its attention is turned outwards; it lives for the future. One of these objects, in other words, is Self-regarding; the other is Other-regarding. . . . Selfishness and unselfishness are two supreme words in the moral life. The first, even in physical Nature, is accompanied by the second. In the very fact that one of the two main springs of life is Other-regarding, there lies a prophecy, a suggestion, of the day of Altruism. In organizing the physiological mechanism of Reproduction, in plants and animals, Nature was already laying wires on which, one far-off day, the currents of all higher things might travel." ("The Ascent of Man," p. 221.) And later,

“Taken prophetically, the function of Reproduction is as much greater than the function of Nutrition as the Man is greater than the Animal, as the Soul is higher than the Body, as Coöperation is greater than Competition, as Love is stronger than Hate. (“The Ascent of Man,” p. 222.)

We clearly see that there are two great factors of organic life, Nutrition and Reproduction, foundation stones of the body and of all that may be above it, and, as Mr. Drummond has demonstrated, certainly the latter of these. Reproduction, is eternal, altruistic (especially in all its higher manifestations), and unlimited.

It is somewhat difficult to see why Mr. Drummond should have seen fit to relegate almost without proof the universal function of nutrition to a place so hopelessly inferior to that of reproduction as to decree that it is mortal, self-centring and limited. It is true that in its origin it is self-regarding, and for the preservation of the individual; while the function of reproduction is at least feebly altruistic from its inception; yet it is equally evident that in its higher development, nutrition takes on a distinctly altruistic form, and only in this form does it play its most important

rôle, in the evolution of the Father. It was not in the providing of food for himself that the Father was made, but in the provision for his mate and offspring.

It seems evident too, that in the higher life, mental, moral and spiritual, there is to be found a pretty clear analogue to nutrition in Truth, its quest and its provision. As Phillips Brooks has said and as others have thought,¹ "Truth and the search for truth are the great food and discipline of human nature." (Sermons. Phillips Brooks.)

We shall have little occasion again to refer at this time to the factor Nutrition, as it has but slight bearing on our subject, beyond that to which attention has already been called.

If we should here adopt Mr. Drummond's view which refers the self-seeking function to maleness and the other-seeking function to femaleness, we should but emphasize and add strength to our attempt to demonstrate the dependence of all life, low and high, upon the family relationships. But although Mr. Drum-

¹ "Truth is the soul's proper food, untruth is its poison. . . . The soul takes its food by believing. . . . Some kinds of truth are like some kinds of food, not very nourishing. . . . Truth about God is the very Bread of Life to our souls." (Letter of E. M. J., 1871.)

mond's standpoint undoubtedly has firm ground beneath it, I have not seen fit to lay stress, here, on his division of function, for three reasons; First: I think that he has but upturned the surface ground about the mystery of sex; and that this root lies deeply buried in the ideal of life itself; that the distinction of sex lies even deeper than the functions of the same; and that this performance of function lies in a male or female way of doing things, rather than in a difference of things done, different though the things done certainly are. This is more in accordance with Mr. Drummond's own theory of involution. Second: He does not take sufficient note of the part of the male in reproduction, for besides the fact that the male is ever essential to reproduction of species, in the germ cell the male element is probably more strictly reproductive than the female, which is rather devoted to growth and nutrition, while in the womb and during lactation, the entire nutrition of the offspring is the work of the female. But it is true that at no time are the functions of male and female the same, and that in the higher reaches, the divisions are probably as Mr. Drummond has drawn them. Third: The matter is not yet clear, and though it may be sufficiently so, to hold as a theory, or part of a theory, it is not so concluded as to warrant me in using it as a basis for a secondary demonstration.

Of the other factor of all life, Reproduction, I

shall have much to say in the sections to follow, and shall but make this note here, that, as to the production of spirit, the only evidence which Nature seems to afford us, aside from the facts involved in the establishment of the major question we are discussing, have bearing upon the production of the human spirit. And this evidence, though of a negative, rather than a positive character, must point the thoughtful mind to the inference that our spiritual life is begotten through reproduction, in an analogous manner to the life of our bodies. It is hardly reasonable to suppose that souls should exist as stored up entities, or come into being, as it were, through special creation or intervention. Reason and hosts of analogies would lead us rather to believe that spiritual natures are born of parent spiritual natures, as, and in conjunction with the physical natures with which they are so closely associated. I do not say that this is proved; but I do maintain that, as far as we know from Nature about the birth of spirit, we are led to infer that spirit is reproduced from other spirit, or at least, from dual parenthood.

So far as we know, all life is from life, phys-

ical and spiritual, and if man or any other have a soul, Nature gives us no other explanation of its origin than that it comes by birth, by heredity. We can admit the possibility of other modes of spiritual production, as we can conceive of a monad existence, (a different kind of protoplasm being granted, and ignoring the question of nutritive supply), developing through ages into a higher type of life, without reproduction, and of a spiritual development accompanying the same; but Nature gives us no more grounds for the one than the other.

Thus far we have spoken of reproduction as a universally found relationship, that is, a relationship found throughout life, in its simplest form, consisting of two constituents, namely, begetterhood and begottenhood, or by more euphonious names, parenthood and childhood. So far as we can see, so far as the eyes of science have ever reached, no life has ever appeared which has not shown the distinct presence of these two relationships. From monad to man, and through every intermediate ramification, these two relationships appear, and they never fail to appear, if we can get close enough to see them.

IV

“Male and Female, Created He Them”

I NEED hardly say that this universal relationship, spoken of in the last section, as a dual one of parenthood and childhood, is in reality a triple relationship, consisting of a dual parentage and an offspring element. But it is quite possible that all of us do not appreciate the universality of this principle of dual parentage, as revealed by the scientific researches of this century, and especially by those of the last ten years. It was understood by men of old, that the fact of sex was an important world principle, and this appreciation was registered in numberless ways, of which one was the peopling of all Nature, by the Greeks and others, with male and female spiritual life. In a later age, it was discovered that every flower of the field, and every forest tree, was male or female, or both. Then the scientists

demonstrated that every individual having life in itself, animal or vegetable, is male or female or both. And perhaps the greatest triumph of the anatomists of to-day is their revelation to us that, without doubt, every living cell in every living organism in all nature has sex. Not even in cell life, do we find anywhere in nature, reproduction without dual parenthood.¹ From the lowest unorganized cell to the highest life expressing itself through organism, from the farthest past to the present day, we find no trace of life without sex. They are inseparable and coëxistent, the one, the foundation of the other ; it would seem as though the very God, from whom all life has come, knows no life without it.

We have alluded to two forms of dual life, that in which one organism is in possession of both elements, and that in which each element is found in a so-called separate organism. The latter has proved itself the higher type since it has resulted in nature's highest products and God's most

¹ I have before me a letter dated October 25, 1900, from Dr. George A. Piersol, America's deservedly best known embryologist, which outlines for me the very latest and soundest views on this subject, and satisfies me of the correctness of these conclusions.

glorious works, the human Father, the human Mother, and the human Child. But we are speaking for the present, of the sexes.

Now in the lowest forms of life in which there is reproduction through dual parenthood resident in the same organism, these elements find themselves placed in close proximity, and unite by some as yet undefined affinity, and their union results in a cleavage or a budding which is a division of the whole organism, the identity of which is practically lost. Sometimes this identity is retained for a while, as a parent or mother cell, to be, later on, lost as above. This is the lowest form of organic life. In the next, in which the sexes are already manifested as separate organisms, there is not yet any married life at all, nor indeed does this appear through many higher grades of the relationship. In these, we have no least expression of individuality, of parenthood, or of any of the beauties which this relationship presents in the higher types of animal life. The entire life of these species seems to be devoted to the one worthy object of reproducing their kind, sometimes perchance placing their offspring amid surroundings suitable for future development.

The relationship has no restriction except that of species. There is no married life, as the parents have no relations beyond the moment, and they never know, nor do they even live to see their offspring alive.

Of the higher examples of these grades of life, we might mention one well known to all of us, the common house-fly. From this stage upward to the mountain heights of the more strictly monogamous mammal lives, there is every finest grade of progress. There is the wolf-spider who watches over her young for a time, but may be eaten by them in return. There are the bees who guard their young most carefully for a time, and maintain a sort of tribal, polyandrous relationship. There are certain wild fowl, who live in polygamous communities, and among whom the young are cared for throughout their short childhood; and the antelopes, whose polygamy is more restricted, and among whom the period of development is of longer duration. Still higher in the scale, we find many birds who live faithfully in pairs, for a season, and care well for their offspring, until they attain maturity. And finally, there are yet higher orders of wild birds, and

animals, as the lion and the eagle, who will abide with one mate faithfully, and for life, and rear up their young, until the need for their care ceases, through the physical maturity of their offspring.¹

As we climb the mountain peaks, the air grows purer, the light more dazzling. A higher ideal of marriage rises, like the sun over the Jungfrau; wedded life as we see it to-day in America, England, Germany; the life toward and beyond which Christ pointed so long ago, when as yet, Nero and the Maximian laws were possible among men. This life is as far above that of even the eagles and the lions, as the sun is above the mountain-tops; and its glory is its spiritual love, where, the body being under arrest, one man and one woman shall live together in faithfulness of body, mind, and soul, so long as they both shall live, and their children shall be theirs for life.

But if, with a smoked glass, we gaze at the sun, we see many a spot on its bright face; and such, alas! there are on the fair glory of wedded life in our land to-day. Such are the black spots

¹ "Whenever man does not interfere, monogamy seems to be the general order of nature with all higher organisms." ("Sexes throughout Nature," Blackwell, p. 143.)

of individual impurity, the dark shadows of Mormonism, the shameful stains of our divorce laws,¹ and of polygamy stereotyped in Sulu. "Suns of the world may stain, when heaven's sun staineth!" But there is a light above the brightness of the sun, there are possibilities for human marriage of which the poet-prophet spake:

"Then comes the statelier Eden back to men :
Then reign the world's great bridals, chaste and calm :
Then springs the crowning race of humankind."

¹ In San Francisco there is an average of one divorce to every six or less marriages. And in the State of California, according to the *Outlook* of November 24, 1900, "Divorce in that State is allowed for cruel and inhuman treatment, and under this clause, according to Mr. Meriwether, divorces have been allowed to the husband, in one case, because his wife failed to sew buttons on his vest ; in another, because she would not get up in the morning nor call him in the morning ; and to the wife because the husband did not come home until ten o'clock at night and kept his wife awake talking sometimes until midnight, etc." But with the *Outlook*, we trust that in the actions of the "Episcopal Committee" we see the dawning of a widespread reaction "in the public sentiment of this country against that freedom of divorce which has been one of the most injurious and dishonoring features of our national life."

V

Man and Woman, Equal and yet Diverse

AT this point, let me say a word or two with regard to the comparative rank of the sexes in the natural economy, and to their diversities; not by way of proof, but in review of certain points which have been recently all but established, and which are, at this time, generally accepted as truth on these subjects.

The author of *Sexuality throughout Nature*, A. B. Blackwell, some years ago traced very carefully the relative positions of the sexes, from their lowest manifestations, (as then recognized) through all nature to mankind, and came to the conclusion, that from the foundation up, the sexes are equally important to, as well as equally advanced in, the economy of nature; that physiologically (physically and mentally), woman is

fitted equally with man, to take the highest places in the reaches of evolution; that any seeming limitation in woman's mental power is but a tardiness or lagging, of short durability, and brought about in the comparatively recent centuries of the world's progress, through the arbitrary, force-born assumption of superiority by man, a necessary, but temporary state of affairs, and in the immediate future to become a thing of the past; that even this superiority is rather assumed than demonstrated, and will at once betray its unsoundness, when equality is recognized and, through co-education and other measures, demonstrated. I trust that I have not misrepresented the author's conclusions by so concisely sketching them. She also thinks that science,—chemistry, physiology, etc.,—analysis in other words, will prove the equal viability of the sexes.

Now, since the appearance of this work, an immense amount of time and attention have been given to the matter; comparative mental anatomy and physiology have been developed to a high degree of usefulness; psychology has done much; education, and especially pedagogy,

sociology and a host of other lines of investigation have added their evidence; and the evidence of life, as we see it, is becoming plainer, as we learn to read. The whole is crystallizing into a diamond of truth, whose point is gradually penetrating even the most leathery among us, the truth that woman balances man in the economy of nature, as a golden pound a silver, on the finest scales,—or as one-half of the needle in a ship's compass, the other. And, although there are still many who do not care to acknowledge this truth, most of such are to be found, I think, in China or the Ottoman Empire. One of our most famous European anatomists, it is true, demonstrated that the average woman's brain weighs slightly less than the average man's, and drew sage conclusions therefrom; but at his own post-mortem examination, it was shown that his own brain weighed decidedly less than his average for women's; so that the scientist would probably modify certain of his conclusions if he could, especially in view of the fact that the anatomists of to-day have paved the way for him.

It seems almost unnecessary to have said even

this much to show the equality of the sexes, which are both as indispensable to life as are the two eyes to binocular vision. If two factors are necessary to prolong the life of which each is a part, it goes without saying that neither can successfully crowd the other out of existence, without self-destruction. Neither sex can therefore, by any possibility, have more competitive vitality-power than the other. Such a state of affairs would at once, compel degeneration.

With regard to the child, I do not think that any one will question the statement that in nature, it is the equal of its parents. (Of course, I am speaking of the racial child, not of the individual whose calibre may be affected by accident.) The child takes on the nature of the parent and, except for the minute increment of evolution, is its equal. And while on this subject, I may say that even this slightest superiority is partially negated by the fact that the parent in turn, is, to an equal degree, superior to the grandparent. Also, I will say, that in the ideal, after which, I believe, human nature to be planned in the perfected relationship, the child is not in any sense superior or inferior to the

parent,¹ for in that, the factor of evolution is eliminated, in our sense of the word, (the sense of perfecting). We must also realize that the duties of obedience, etc., which the child owes to its parents, are not the expression of inequality in nature, but of difference of function.

Now, to return to woman; though she is the absolute equal of man, she is also absolutely diverse from him. She is his equal in rank, she is his complement in nature. Or more definitely still, she and he are balancing complements in human nature, and, the third component, child, being added, make up human nature. There have been many demonstrations of this fact, and from many standpoints, of which the most conclusive and satisfying is that of Mr. Drummond in those chapters of the *Ascent of Man*, in which he traces the progress of the race through sex, and the evolution of the mother and father. No one has done this so beautifully, or understood the question so thoroughly as he. And what are his evidences from nature? That from their

¹ "The child is the climax and culmination of all God's creation, and to answer the question 'What is a child?' is to approach the still greater question—'What is the Creator and Giver of Life?'"—*Parker*.

foundation upward, the sexes have been working at the same general problem, but at opposite sides of it. They have worked more and more together, as to the problem, but with ever specializing instruments, and at ever specializing work. The more they work, the more they diverge, and yet, as the hands in a factory, the more absolutely indispensable they become to each other. In the very nature of their callings, they must ever become more indispensably divergent.

Hermaphroditism is unnatural and a sign of degeneracy in the individual, or of stagnation in the species. A womanish man is an abhorrence, a mannish woman is a horror. A man may be brave and a woman may be brave. Each may be true, and each may love. But each will do so in the way that belongs to his or her nature, and man is as different from woman as the ocean from the shore, as the sun at noon, from the starry splendor of the summer night, as Thackeray from George Eliot, as Robert Browning from Elizabeth, as a father from a mother, as a man from his own wife.

“That cleavage, therefore, which began in a merely physical region, is now seen to extend into the psychical realm, and ends by supplying the world with two great and forever sepa-

rate types. No efforts, or explanations, or expostulations can ever break down that distinction between maleness and femaleness, or make it possible to believe that they were not destined from the first of time to play a different part in human history. Male and female never have been and never will be the same. They are different in origin; they have traveled to their destinations by different routes; they have had different ends in view." ("Ascent of Man," p. 256.)

" For woman is not undevelop't man,
 But diverse ; could we make her as the man,
 Sweet Love were slain ; his dearest bond is this,
 Not like to like, but like in difference.
 Yet in the long years liker must they grow ;
 The man be more of woman, she of man ;
 He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
 Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world ;
 She, mental breadth, nor fail in childward care,
 Nor lose the childlike in the larger mind ;
 Till at the last, she set herself to man,
 Like perfect music unto noble words.
 And so these twain, upon the skirts of Time,
 Sit side by side, full-sumn'd in all their powers,
 Dispensing harvest, sowing the To-be,
 Self-reverent each and reverencing each,
 Distinct in individualities,
 But like each other ev'n as those who love."

VI

The Unit of Humanity

IN seeking to find what there may be in God which stands as prototype to human life or any phase thereof, it will be well to know to what simple terms we can reduce this human life, for all that Nature has ever taught men of God has been on broad and simple lines. Let us then see for a moment if we are able to find a unit of humanity, some simplest representation of it, which yet will leave out no essential part. Some such reduction to simplest terms, many of us think we find in the story of Eden, in which we still believe we see more meaning than in any mere "myth" that ever a race invented for us to dub "folk-lore."

What is the unit of humanity? What is a unit? In mathematics, a unit is the smallest known determinate quantity, by the constant repetition of which, any other quantity of the

same kind is measured. In chemistry, a unit is a molecule, the smallest possible portion of a substance into which it may supposably be divided, without destroying the identity of the substance. In other words, and in general then, a unit is the smallest factor of anything, which yet lacks no essential other than repetition. What is this factor in humanity? A man? Surely not, for a million million men would never make humanity, nor a million million women. What then? A man and a woman? No, not even these. Two essentials are yet lacking, the only possible bond which represents the reason for their union, and the only factor which stands for human progress. Both these the child supplies. The unit of humanity is the family and nothing less and nothing more. Divide it, and humanity is lost to view. Multiply it, and nothing in all human life will be lacking. Multiply it and tribes and nations will appear and everything that makes them such. Multiply it and the love which it begets, and the world will teem with love and every human virtue. History, and all anthropology are but composites of the family life. Philanthropy and brotherly love are the

overflow of the love that binds these three in one. As the unit of water consists of two distinct and purest hydrogen atoms, bound together by one of oxygen, so does that of humanity consist of two distinct parent atoms bound together by a child. The unit of humanity is the family, three elements in one, and each is as necessary to the other two as the three are to life.

“There is no such thing in nature as a man, or for that matter as an animal, except among the very humblest forms.” (Science does not now allow of even this exception.) “Wherever there is a higher animal there is another animal; wherever there is a savage there is another savage—the other half of him, the female savage. This much at least sex has done for the world—it has abolished the numeral one. Observe, it has not merely discouraged the existence of one; it has abolished the numeral one. The solitary animal must die and leave no successor. Unsociableness, therefore, is banished out of the world; it has become the very condition of continued existence that there should be always a family group, or at least a pair.” (When speaking of the race there cannot be said even this “at least.”) (“The Ascent of Man,” p. 244.)

But it may be objected that the family relationships were made for the sole purpose of perpetu-

ating the race. That they do perpetuate the race I will admit, that they are necessary to all life as God has made it, I maintain. The family relationships were made to make the race and more, they are the race. As "Mother Carey" said and laughed, "Know, silly child, that any one can make things, if they will take time and trouble enough; but it is not every one who, like me, can make things make themselves." This is what God has done in the evolution of the family. But to say that the family was made alone to perpetuate the race is no more reasonable than to say that we read books to pile them one by one upon our shelves, and not "for life"; or that we build a church to pile one stone upon another and not to worship God. Mind builds with an aim, not for the sake of building. It may be that some men still work thus aimlessly, the God I see in Nature never does so. The grandest thing that God has ever made is the human family, father, mother and child, and this was never made to fit the race it crowns; the race was made to fit God's great ideal. This is reason.

"To say even that the machinery evolved him is as preposterous as to say of a poem that the printing press

made it. The ultimate problem is, Who made the machine? and who thought the poem that was to be printed?" ("The Ascent of Man," p. 202.)

"To say that the sex distinction is necessary to sustain the existence of life in the world is no answer, since it is at least possible that life could have been kept up without it." ("The Ascent of Man," p. 148.)

Poets have ever been prophets from before the days of David, or of the writer of Jonah. (Whether Jonah be poetic fiction, or history, or both, does not affect the question.) And why is it so? Is it not because through the closest communion with truth and beauty they learn to feel, what others must see, to know? Thus he who wrote of Jonah knew that God was not for Jews alone, but for every one who breathed His breath of life. And David, that man must some day have a spiritual king and saviour. "Gird on Thy sword upon Thy thigh, O mighty One, Thy Glory and Thy Majesty." (Ps. xlv. 3.) And Job knew that he would some day find his essential redeemer. "I know that my redeemer liveth." (Job xix. 25.) And even in this our day, two purest poets have prophesied—the one of eternal

individuality, the other of eternal union. I speak of course of Browning and of Tennyson.

Man will live and rise by growing ever more truly three in one, and ever more closely one in three.

VII

The Trends of Evolution. Father, Mother and Child

“One God, one law,¹ one element,²
And one far-off divine event,³
To which the whole creation moves.”

—*Tennyson.*

IN consecrating a separate section to the bearings of Evolution, I have no thought of divorcing it from Nature, of which of course, it is an essential factor, but I have done so, because its bearing upon our problem is of special significance.

The facts in the history of human marriage are innumerable, and the authorities are many, but in Darwin's *Descent of Man*, Geddes and Thomson's *The Evolution of Sex*, Westermarck's

¹ Love.

² The family.

³ The consummation of the image of the ideals.

History of Human Marriage, Drummond's Ascent of Man, and in the works of Piersol and other living embryologists, we find the most satisfactory and suggestive material bearing upon the subject. I know of no study in Nature that is more full of interest, or more pregnant with meaning, more full of promise or more inspiring by its beauty, than this of the origin and history of marriage and its place in Nature. I cannot go into the matter deeply, for I should be carried away, or lose myself. It is only necessary for me to call your attention again to certain broad facts that we have learned, especially from Mr. Drummond and Mr. Fiske, and which are now accepted in principle, and probably in fact, as true.

From the days of the appearance of life on the earth, evolution has been unceasingly busy at a number of problems, which in their present state, show results of her labors in what are now involved in pure monogamous marriage, and united family life. I have no hesitation in saying that, although these institutions are not yet, by any means, perfected, they are the highest reaches of evolution to the present time, and

their reason for being is found in that which is to follow.

The latter statement I have endeavored to illustrate in the preceding section; the former is clearly shown in Drummond's *Ascent of Man*.

Evolution has worked to produce three factors in humanity, the mother, the father, and the child; and these together are humanity. And these wonders of the world have been produced through processes, the ingenuity and intricacy, and the ramifications of which we shall never know, but whose beauty we are beginning dimly to guess at. In briefest outline they are these: From the bisexual cell which becomes extinct at the birth of its offspring, through the partly understood methods of development, environment, natural selection, etc., to the lowest organism in which the sexes are divided, and which pours out upon land and water an endless progeny, which offspring the progenitors never know,—from these, through countless higher grades, to those in which there is some, as yet unmaternal provision for a more limited progeny, then to a state in which, through the development of bodily dependence of offspring on par-

ents, closer limitation of number of offspring, and lengthened childhood, maternity dawns upon the earth; while through the necessity of protection and food supply, paternity is born. And as we approach the condition of savage man, from the bond of the child, from the common love of their offspring, the mutual love and sympathy of parent for parent is evolved. From this date on, the progress is rapid.

It is to Mr. Fiske that we are indebted for the priceless contribution to our understanding of the factors of evolution, in his demonstration of the influences upon development of the prolongation of childhood. The human child brought love and family life.

The averages for the length of childhood, and for the age for marriage, are steadily rising. In America, we are children until we are twenty-five or more years of age, and thirty is becoming a common age for marriage. The higher the culture and standard of life, the later seems to be the average of these dates. In China, children are such while their parents live. This is largely due to the honored place of parenthood in that otherwise, night-bound land.

The arrest of the body begins and the development of spirit. Childhood is long, children are few, the temporary home gives way to permanent

association. This in turn, as Drummond shows, obliterates seasonal conception, and binds father to mother through the love of their offspring, and child to parent through mutual dependence.

It may be said that the lengthening of the period which we have called childhood, has another important result. Among the poor especially, who are always in the majority, the relation changes from one where the child depends on the parent, to one where the parent depends on the child, thus completing the circle, as it were.

And the end—no, the end is not yet. But we see, in these our days, what has at last been evolved, through toil and striving unimaginable, the home life of Christian lands.

What is this home life? It is the life of the family. It is that life which is found where one man and one woman, having learned to love each other through reason, finding in each other the seeds of true manhood and true womanhood, which will bear in time, the fruits of faithful motherhood and fatherhood, are living together according to the highest of human ideals, and rearing children in the same. “Physically, psychically, ethically, the family is the masterpiece

of evolution. The creation of evolution, it was destined to become the most active instrument and ally which evolution ever had. For what is its evolutionary significance? It is the generator and reposer of the forces which alone can carry out the social and moral progress of the world." ("Ascent of Man," p. 316.) All love, all wisdom, all goodness that the world has ever known, have been its outgrowth, and human life will never know any holier or purer relationships than those which are latent in, and to be revealed through the life of the family.

I have dwelt upon the place and functions of the sexes and of the family in nature, not because their glories are the glories of the grown-up monad, for this, evolution never teaches. Mr. Drummond has spoken authoritatively upon this subject in that wonderful chapter "Involution" in the *Ascent of Man*, and there he compares evolution to a flowering plant, and shows that as the flower is not in the root, neither is the monad to be looked for in man. It is not there.

. . . Evolution is a process of accretion from environment, not of growth from within. The plant is not the grown-up root, any more than the root is a grown-up flower. A diamond is not a great big carbon atom, neither is a piece of coal. Accretion has made the brightest gem in inorganic nature, and ac-

cretion, environment, or evolution,—the painting hand of God has made the brightest jewel in organic life.

And what of the future of this holy thing? And how are we to tell what that may be? The future of humanity is bound up in that of the family. Humanity can never live without it. Says Fiske, "From the first dawning of life, we see all things working together toward one mighty goal, the evolution of the most exalted qualities which characterize humanity." ("The Destiny of Man," p. 113.) And Drummond says, more truly than perhaps, he ever knew, "Nature has produced a holy family. Not for centuries, but for millenniums, the family has survived. Time has not tarnished it; no later art has improved it; nor genius discovered anything more lovely nor religion anything more divine. From the bee's cell and the butterfly's wing men draw what they call arguments from design; but it is in the kingdoms that come without observation, in these great immaterial orderings which science is but beginning to perceive, that the purposes of creation are revealed." ("Ascent of Man," p. 318.)

Scientists are quite agreed in believing that the

evolution of the body is slowly coming to a standstill, and that in it lie all the possibilities which the future human life will require. It is large enough to have held the life of Christ. Some have even suggested the possibility of a beginning of degeneration. However this may be, we may be sure that the future of human evolution lies in the development of the higher reaches of life. From now on, we are to advance in the mental, the moral, and the spiritual, and especially in the last named. The future of man is to be a spiritual future, even in this life. And the three great factors of that human future will be an ever more spiritual fatherhood, motherhood, and childhood, an ever more spiritual family. In that future, sexuality will be forgotten in mutual love.

And how are we to look into this radiant future? As the skilful archer, who with foot planted on firm ground, with eager soul and steadfast eye, follows the arrow's flight to the far distant goal.

We take our stand at the beginning of things. Straight as the arrow's flight, the trend of evolution leads the eye along the past, through the

shining present, to the misty but dazzling goal of the future.

It is a vision that we see, a pure and holy thing, such as human words can but half describe. It seems a world of human homes, such as few have seen, even in dreams. And in each home a man and a woman dwells as one, and the bond between them is a little child. Children are few in that far distant land; (a thousand million years nearer than it seemed 1,900 years ago;) but these are loved as only parents can love, who come of a race that has lived in chastity and peace for ages past. Children are children while their parents live. All men are equal, and all men are as brothers, which, by adoption, they seem indeed to be. There are no nations there, nor governments, nor kings; and the only law throughout that world is love. The bodies of that race are much as ours, more healthy, cleaner, sweeter to the sight, but through their eyes shine out such souls as even God only makes through endless years of toil. They understand the world in which they live, and live as men of wisdom and of power. They understand the men with whom they dwell, and dwell in perfect peace and

charity. One thing above all else, is prized and cherished there, and that is the life within the home, where three or four live in such harmony as makes the life seem but the life of one, and from it flow all other life and love. And every morning, when the sun comes up, each one in three, all holy, father, mother, and child, clasped hand in hand, will kneel upon the sod, and turn their eyes toward the glowing East, and wait awhile, then rise and go to earn their daily bread. The work is all but done.

When I consider what one mother is, I stagger at the thought of what God yet may do.

VIII

The Seventh Commandment of Nature

NATURE has more than one of the decalogue boldly written in her grand old book, but that which is perhaps the most easily deciphered is to be found in a chapter clearly headed "Thou Shalt not Commit Adultery." And this is not all of the matter, for she has followed and emphasized this chapter by the plainest and most uncompromising of her written curses.

And thank God that even within the memory of history we trace a trend toward obedience to His commandment. And the future is, as ever, full of promise.

As we turn back these pages of the world's history not so very far, only a page or two, as time runs,—we come upon great blots and stains, black with the blood of innocence and smeared with the filth of lust. We read of

Sodom the Polluted, and of the beastly beauty of Daphne's Grove; of the Maximian laws, the vilest things that were ever made by men, and of Nero the Despised; of Borgian delights, and of the passions of Henry VIII. of England, of the passing worship of the Hindoos and on the very page on which the pen of time is writing to-day, we read of New York and Philadelphia and their police-protected hells, and of august deliberations concerning the adoption of the "practical" license laws of Paris, the adulteress.

But the light is brightening as we read, and the pages are cleaner one by one. In the book of Nature and in the book of Revelation is written, though in differing language, one great and identical law; and in both books, it is enforced by a blessing, and by a curse. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," and "They that commit adultery, their blood shall be upon them."

Physically the family is one flesh so long as it is inviolate. Father and mother are one and the child is one with them and the bond between them, and the wedded life is another bond. This unity Nature guards with never flagging

care, and its infringement she punishes with degeneration and death.

Broadly she guards the family life by guarding the species into which evolution has moulded it. Species are protected from their birth up and the barrier wall is impassable. In the recent discovery that to each species there seems to be apportioned a particular and invariable number of chromatin filaments to its segmentation nucleus probably lies the physical basis for the long known fact that the attempt to mix species is invariably unproductive of viable offspring. Whether this be the basis of the fact or no, the fact remains.

The barriers which further narrow in the family unity are many and varied and are adapted to defend various threatened directions of attack. The home life of the family is guarded first by the fact, that the consensus of human opinion and the laws of nations from time immemorial have forbidden consanguineous marriages. The results of the latest scientific investigations seem to show that Nature also has forbidden these marriages, since the risk of perpetuating and emphasizing any vitiation is so

greatly increased thereby, as almost to ensure the decay of the family.

Another bulwark of family purity is built upon the fact that its assault results in unfitted fathers and incompetent mothers and consequently in ill fed, ill clothed, ill cared for, unsurviving and degenerate children whose end is the death of their line.

The last of these natural defences of family unity that I shall mention is that which brings in its sentence not only upon the innocent elements of the family but especially upon the offender and guilty one. I speak of that group of organic diseases which the medical profession has classified together because of their origin and abiding place in the polluted lives of the world. Within this group are some of the most loathsome and disgusting and most destructive diseases and their complications to which the body of man is heir, literally heir, alas! too frequently. It is true that the innocent are often afflicted with these curses of Nature but, in these cases, it is almost without exception that the disease is introduced through the agency of some guilty one. In the majority of cases the offender is the hus-

band and father, and there is no exaggeration in saying that the lives of thousands upon thousands of purest women and innocent children are hopelessly wrecked each year, because thus sinned against. The largest percentage of cases of the diseases peculiar to women are contracted thus innocently, and there are more incurably blind in our asylums, and these so from their birth, from this, than from any other known cause. It is the physicians of the world who see and know these things, and though they have done much to relieve and save the innocent and the guilty, it is they again, who know that the radical cure is to be found neither in the salts of mercury nor in the iodide of potassium, but in that pure salt of the earth that loses not its savor, in men and women whose hearts are pure with the love that thinketh no evil.

Of the various more perverted sins against physical purity, I can say no more here, than that there are many such, and that the wrecks they leave to the care of our private and municipal insane asylums are ghastly monuments to the faithfulness of Nature's sentries.

But it is not in the physical alone, that Nature

will be obeyed. In the realm of the higher life as well, her law is in force. As there are no stronger loves in all Nature, nor none so strong as those which bind the family in one, so there are no baser crimes than those which sin against these loves. The names of parricide, of matricide, of fratricide and of the unfaithful to marriage vows, to innocence, and to purity of life, the world over are in abhorrence. This is true, even among those nations and tribes who have never known any other than the commandments of Nature. The laws of nations punish many of these crimes, the laws of Nature punish all of them. Our prisons and asylums swarm with the dying proofs of Nature's verdicts, and many of the rotting lives that come to the notice of the healers of souls and bodies, and to that of no others except the aching hearts at home, bear added testimony. There are habits which never leave any physical trace whatever but yet result in total mental, moral, and spiritual shipwreck, and there are others which clog the higher reactions and sympathies to an all but incredible degree.

I was talking not long ago with a man, who

spoke freely to me of his past life, and rather boasted of it, and especially of the fact that he had escaped "unscathed." He was at that time engaged to be married to a good woman and true, and was happy in his good fortune. He seemed anxious that I should concur in his opinion, that on the whole he had done pretty well in having had his times, and yet kept his place as a respected citizen, won the love of a good woman and successfully guarded his health; and was not a little offended at my sentiments of decided disapproval of his past. It was some time before I was even able to make him understand that we were looking at the matter from directly opposite points of view, that my regrets were, far more than for him, for the women whom he had used for his pleasure and for their ruin, that it was over their comparative innocence that I yearned, rather than his bribery and cowardice that I regretted. And yet it is an open question whether the degradation of those who sinned and saw, is as great as that of him who sinned and could not see. But the view came to him as a revelation, for he had looked upon those once pure children, as degenerate though necessary

factors of society, and supposed that his share in their ruin would be negated by the fact that there would be fast women whether he were virtuous or not.

That man is now married and may yet be a faithful, happy husband and father, and those women are outcasts and pariahs, women "taken in adultery." Yet let only him that is without sin among us first cast a stone at them, for both Nature and Revelation have evolved ideals of purity higher even than the old, and the new commandment reads, "Every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

IX

God's Ideals

STANDING on the heights of human nature, we have been tracing together, as best we could, in the light of the truth that men have striven for and won, the majestic, slow development of God's great work through the ages. We have gazed along the narrowing vistas of the past, and through them as they widen into the unfinished splendor of the present; and we have peered into the misty future, by the search lights we have found in creation's trends; and that future gives promise beyond all hopes.

We believe that God is painting the image of an eternal ideal, an ideal of life as He knows it, of life in the highest. And these are the lessons that we have learned. That there is no evidence of the existence of any life, organic or spiritual, high or low, which does not consist of three

elements, namely, a dual parenthood and offspring therefrom. That these three elements are universal in life as we know it. That these three elements are the necessary basis of all life.

We have next learned that as progress has manifested itself, there has developed a separation of the dual parenthood into two organisms, which still later, we may call persons, and that these separated elements have taken upon themselves distinct and progressively specializing functions or lines of work; and moreover, that there is no evidence which points otherwise than that these types, which we have called male and female, will continually become more and more specialized and separate, and never will and never can become alike or the same.

We have learned too, that while this separation of the personality is certain and progressive, there is developing along with it, and at the same time with it, a force tending to, and compelling interdependence and unity, and that this force which in its lowest manifestation is physical, through the compulsion of the third element in life, flowers out into that glorious thing we call love. We have learned that the trend of love is

to make, forever closer and closer, unity in family life, and that all other loves are based upon and spring from this greatest of loves.

Mr. Fiske has taught us that on earth there will never be a higher creature than man; and Mr. Drummond, that the human family is and ever will be the crowning glory of humanity. We have seen too, that from an unlimited and unmothered offspring, Nature has, with steady hand, pointed to an ever-limiting progeny, an ever-lengthening childhood, and an ever-deepening parenthood; that strict monogamy is Nature's highest type of married life; and that physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually, men and women are equal in Nature's economy, and equally fitted to survive. And finally, we have seen that, as the human organism shows unmistakable signs of arrest, it becomes manifest that the future development of the family will lie in creation's higher reaches, in the mental, moral, and spiritual, and that the ideal or highest reaches will be spiritual.

This is what Nature teaches of God's ideal of life. It is this that the artist has painted into his work.

Study in the Book of Nature 143

If God be life in the highest, and it is not reasonable to suppose otherwise, for His is the conceptive mind; if the mind of God be rational, and ours are insane if we can think otherwise; if we have read the trends of Nature aright, and I think the chances for doubt are very slight; it seems to me that it is hardly reasonable or possible for us to come to any other conclusion than that this ideal of highest life, of finished work, is represented in the very life of the eternal God, for it is not conceivable that such a mind, a mind neither hampered by frailties nor restricted by misconceptions, should deliberately, and with infinity of purpose, draw up the plans for His greatest work on any other than the purest lines or from any but the highest type. It is not rational that God should know of a better life, and make through the ages a less good; that He should be the eternal ideal, and bring about a degeneration.¹ Nor is it at all likely that He should develop special universal ideas, to fit a purposed creation, but rather that He should bring

¹ This truth of analogy is probably far broader even than its application to the question we are discussing, and therefore applicable to other possible truths about God and His nature.

the creation to fit His ideals. It is the wisdom of humanity to sing and paint and write and teach the best it knows, to create the image of its highest ideals, and the God of our wisdom cannot be less wise than His image.

This conception of God is not opposed to Cosmic Theism. As Doctor Wace says, "There seems, in fact, to lurk an extraordinary sophism in the offence which is taken at so-called anthropomorphism. Men observe the operation of the inanimate forces of nature, and deduce from them the methods of God's operation. There, they will say, you observe the course of His action; and you notice its absolute regularity, and the absence of any indication that we can detect of its disturbance by personal action or will. But the moment the moralist, or the theologian, points to another sphere of nature—that of human nature, which is nature still—and argues from it in a similar manner, regarding it as a revelation of part at all events, of God's method of action, we are denounced as anthropomorphic. Be it so. But what is the scientific conception but—if I may be allowed to coin the word—physico-morphism? They see the likeness and reflection of God in nature; we see the image and reflection of God in man; and why not the one as well as the other?" ("The Gospel and Its Witnesses," p. 103.)

X

The Image in the Glass

To hear chords sounding in the herd's deep lowing,¹
To taste that daily bread is twice life giving,²
To feel that air is less than we are breathing,³
And see a vision where the west wind's blowing ;⁴
To know that there is knowledge past the knowing,⁵
To live since life is more than human living,⁶
To speak and write what we are thus receiving
Nor reaping to refuse in turn the sowing ;⁷

For this we are ;⁸ and we and all that hand
And eye and mind and soul can grasp but speak
An imaged life⁹—and these are but the glass.¹⁰
And every best, of sky and sea and land
Will fade and go¹¹—the glass itself will break.¹²
The imaged life alone will never pass.¹³

¹ Father and Creator, Ps. l. 9,
and Gen. i. 25.

⁴ One God, 2 Sam. xxii. 11.

⁵ Love, Eph. iii. 19.

⁷ Faith, 1 John i. 3.

⁹ Revelation, Ps. xix.

¹¹ End of things temporal,
Matt. xxiv. 35.

² Son, Mark xiv. 22.

³ Holy Spirit, Birth through
the Spirit, John xx. 22.

⁶ Knowledge, John xvii. 3.

⁸ Hope, Matt. vii. 7.

¹⁰ Nature, 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

¹² Death, 1 Cor. xv. 22.

¹³ Immortality, Col. iii. 3.

XI

Ideas About God

WHAT are the ideas of men about God, and whence did men derive them? From the far-off dawn when primæval men first conceived the most shadowy notions of invisible powers outside and beyond themselves, and began to personify these powers, we may say that men have had ideas about God, and it was in Nature's school that these were learned. From that time, and for century upon century, the light has been slowly breaking over the life of the world, until a certain hour, nineteen hundred years ago, when the Sun arose in all his splendor, and on the mountain peaks, men no longer guessed, but knew God; and ever since that eternal sunrise, the shadows have been fleeing away.

It was Nature that first taught men about God, and through the opening book of Nature alone,

the greater part of men have seen Him. Sometimes hers is a still small voice, when she speaks of righteousness and peace, and again, in awful diapason she proclaims that God is Wisdom and Power. In the ages of creation, men learn that God is eternal. In the unity of all things, they see that He is immanent. Through progress, they learn that He lives; through goodness, that He is righteous; through reason, that He is Mind and Wisdom. In the faithfulness of Nature, they learn that God is Truth; in the reaches of Evolution, they see that He is Spirit; and Jesus has shown them in the words of Nature and in the needs of men, that God is Father and that God is Son.

It is thus that men have come to know God through Nature, by the observation of ideals, as He has written them and is writing them throughout the pages of her book, and by applying them through reason to Him. Men have seen these grand ideals, and recognized their universality, have applied them, and know their reasonableness, and have said, "This is of God." "This is the nature of God." Some men know that God is Power, Wisdom, and Truth, that He is

Righteousness, Purity and Life, that He is Light, Peace, and Love, that He is universal, immanent, and eternal,—Spirit and Law,—Father and Son. “The lesson of evolution is that through all these weary ages the Human Soul has not been cherishing in religion a delusive phantom, but in spite of seemingly endless groping and stumbling, it has been rising to the recognition of its essential kinship with the ever-living God.”¹ “Evolution is Advolution; better, it is Revelation,—the phenomenal expression of the Divine,—the progressive realization of the Ideal, the Ascent of Love.”²

We think that in the preceding sections, we have traced out other ideals of God's life, written on every page of Nature's book, becoming plainer and more majestic through the ages, growing higher, clearer, and purer, as she reaches into the present times, and giving promise of marvelous consummation in the years yet unborn; ideals of surpassing beauty, ideals universal, eternal, and perfected; ideals of the very God who is perfect.

And these are the conclusions that we may draw from our study of the Book of Nature.

¹ “Through Nature to God,” Fiske, p. 191.

² “Ascent of Man,” Drummond, p. 339.

God's is a spiritual life, and a life complete in itself, that is, it consists of three elements, certainly not less, and certainly not more; and these three elements do now and forever stand in relationship to each other as eternal Father, Mother, and Begotten. God's life is a complete unity, and the bond which makes it such is consummated Family love. We may infer that this love is the basis of God's love for created things. We may also infer that the Begotten of God is limited, and although Nature does not thus far teach that it is limited to one Personality, one such Begotten One satisfies all possible indications of Nature's teachings.

This is the God of Nature, the natural God, the satisfaction of every kind of thought, or creed. We are told in the paper of which this is the companion, that the threefold nature of God forms the basis of perhaps all the great religions of the world, and though this is not a proof in itself, it certainly demonstrates the reasonableness of the faith to the human intellect. This reasonableness may also be demonstrated through another and entirely different channel, namely through the logical method of philosophic

thought. Let me quote two passages from one of the clearest writers of the present day, on philosophic religion, Dr. A. J. Mason, and ask you to read our truth into the words of the writer, who, by the way, never hints at the truth itself, and probably had no thought of it in connection with the subject of which he wrote, the Holy Trinity, and let me ask you also, to judge for yourself whether truth fits truth, or no.

“God is love. That is His essence. And love is not love without exercise. Until it finds an object, there is but a capacity for love, not love itself. If God, therefore, had no object for His love until He had formed a creation, then God has not always been love—is not love by Himself in His own nature, but only (so to speak) accidentally, through the circumstances in which He finds Himself. And even now, if creation be the sole object of God's love, He cannot find in it adequate exercise for the whole of His love. For we have no reason to suppose that creation is, or can be, infinite. It may well be doubted whether the total fulness of God's being can ever be expressed in that which God makes. Therefore, although infinite love is at work in

every part of creation, yet the exercise of it upon creation is not infinite. There remains behind an infinite reserve of love, which never can be expended to the blessed satisfaction of God upon any existing thing which falls short of Himself. And if we say that before creation was, the infinite love of God was infinitely expended upon Himself, we cannot but feel that such an expression would be shocking to all our best instincts, if God is a single person. A monstrous selfishness is the only picture which such language could suggest. It can only be morally true to say that God loves Himself, if there be eternally within the Divine nature a real distinction of persons, whereby one Divine person may lavish the infinite wealth of His love upon another Divine person, who is infinitely worthy of receiving it.

“It may, of course, be said that we are judging from what we know of limited, human existence; and that what applies to a limited being need not perforce apply to an infinite, a Divine being. This is quite true: but at the same time, if man is made in the image of God, we have some right to form conceptions about His nature

from our own, within due and reverent limits. And if, as a matter of fact, we are wrong in this particular conception and it should at length burst upon us as true that God is a monad, a unit, but aware, before all creation of His own existence, cognizant of the fulness of His powers, and eternally exercising a paternal love, we can only say that such a state of things would not only transcend our experience and thought, but that it would contradict it. Assuming the Arian belief to be true, nothing within our reach leads us in the direction of the true belief, or gives us any hint that may afterward be developed into knowledge. Quite the contrary. Hard though it may be to understand the Church doctrine of the Trinity, it is much harder to conceive how God could be eternally love, if He were a solitary unit.”¹ (“The Faith of the Gospel,” pp. 41-43.)

“Unless, therefore, we are to take refuge in supposing that God is not self-sufficient, but is only, as Pantheism fancies, gradually coming to know Himself by means of the world, we are

¹ I have submitted this passage to the judgment of one who is better trained than I, in philosophic thought, and he assures me that the logic of the argument is sound and irrefutable.

drawn to believe, with the Church, that God contains in His own being both subject and object. We human beings find ourselves set off by the world of which we form part; but God must be set off to Himself by something within His own nature. He must be presented to His own contemplation. There must be some movement by which eternally He is reflected to Himself. God must be ever inwardly projected, reproduced,—or rather projecting, reproducing Himself; not by a succession of fresh reproductions, for we have no right to say that with God, there is any succession, but by one act of reproduction, complete and abiding, yet ever new, as if the one act were always in the living process of being performed. Thus there must ever confront Him somewhat which is at once Himself and not Himself, which He can regard as embodying His own whole being, while still (in a sense) separate from and contrasted with, that which in the first instance is the 'I,' the 'Ego' of God.

“But if there is to be such a reflection of God to Himself, the reflection must needs be personal, in the same sense in which God Himself is per-

sonal. God would in no true way be represented to Himself by a mere picture or image in a mirror, so to speak, lifeless, and without power to respond to Him. It is inconceivable that there should be within the nature of God anything which is not life; and even if it were conceivable, a lifeless image of God would return to Him, not only an inadequate, but a totally false vision of Himself. That which truly reproduces God must be to Him, not 'It' but 'Thou'; and God in turn must be 'Thou' to that which reproduces Him. And if God is truly to know Himself, the living image which is before Him must be in every respect worthy of Him, that is, equal to Him. Any partial representation of God falls infinitely short of Him; and no number of finite and partial representations could mount up so as to supply the deficiency. No part of God's perfections and possibilities can at any time be absent from His consciousness; and they cannot be present to it in infinite detail without being present in their complete unity. Therefore of necessity that absolute reproduction by which God is set before His own eyes must be God, because otherwise, God's self-knowledge would

fall infinitely short of the truth. Nothing but God can represent God.

“ Thus we seem led even by reason, apart from revelation to see the need of a duality in the Divine nature. But we are unable to rest here. Although the next step in thought is less easy to express in words, the mind naturally demands a bond between the ‘I’ and the ‘Thou,’ by which they are to know themselves as ‘I’ and ‘Thou.’ There is, in the Godhead the subject and the object; but how are they related to each other? Duality gives us only the notion of separation. If there were no other movement in the Divine nature but that whereby the first person projects himself into a second, the two might, for all we can see, be left forever gazing upon each other, without knowing the difference between themselves, without mutual sympathy, and therefore without freedom of intercourse. A God whose nature was but dual could hardly to our thinking, rise to as high a level of intelligence as man’s. There might be mutual observation and attraction; but not the consciousness either of antithesis or of union. In order that God may be complete and self-sufficing,

there must be within the unity of His nature a process which establishes mutual knowledge and along with mutual knowledge, mutual love. We shall expect to find the movement whereby God places Himself before Himself, followed up by a movement whereby He makes Himself fully known, in all His lovableness and wisdom, to the object thus set before Him, and receives back the response of that object. And we may perhaps dimly apprehend how this mediation between the Divine 'I' and 'Thou' should itself be fitly the work of a person. Were it not so, there would be one view (so to speak) of God, which He would not Himself be able to gain. He would not have the blessedness of seeing Himself effect that union that is within Himself. And as we saw that the object in which God is reproduced to Himself must be in all points equal with God, so the person who mediates between the two, must be in all points the equal of either, or He could not adequately interpret the one to the other. *It seems to put the completing touch to the glory of the Divine life, when we see person and person eternally made known to each other, in their difference and in their unity, by a person*

to whom both are absolutely known, and who is absolutely one with both." ("The Faith of the Gospel," pp. 43-46.)

Even if we cannot build our faith on such close and intricate reasoning as this, it would seem as if two questions about God would inevitably arise in every human soul, questions growing out of its own most sacred needs and cravings,—Why should the nature of God alone have no complemental reactive life? Why should the nature of God alone have no Begotten One,—not to succeed Him, but to be of Him? In our human relationships, the higher we ascend, the more we crave them; the more spiritual we become, the more they mean to us; the more divine we become, the more we feel that they are indispensable to our fullest life.

It is because God's nature is love, that He is one. Love is the bond that makes His unity. It is because God's nature is love that He is three. Love is the reason that makes Him Trinity.

XII

A Parable

MANY, many years ago, there was a king called Agape, because he loved his people. His kingdom was broad and rich, yet the possession which he loved the best was a small and arid island in the middle sea. He had often visited this island, but ever in disguise and unknown to the wild men who dwelt there, for it was his greatest desire that this people should learn to know him through his works alone.

Therefore, from the day when first he became possessed of its rugged shores, the king sent thither many trained gardeners with seeds and grain and roots innumerable, and all other things needful, and so, before many years had passed, great trees had sprung up, to temper the summer suns, and countless fields were yellow with wheat and every grain, and the people had bread,

and ate no longer the rough sea food; and the very rocks were clothed with the greenest grass. All this the king did, and more. And the people knew him somewhat through his works, they knew that there were trees and grass and wheat and many good things in the king's own gardens, for all these things were of him.

And later on, he caused to be planted there myriads of lovely flowers of every tint and shade. Flowers bloomed from end to end, and shore to shore of that most blessed isle, and the gardeners showed the people that flowers had been with them since that far-off day, when the king began to rule. For every grass blade had its little flower, and the trees and the grain had theirs, for in the flower was life, and there was nothing that grew but by the power of the life in the flower. But, strange to say, the people never saw the king in these; and they said, "In the king's gardens there are no flowers. Why should there be?"

Then there appeared upon the land a new flower, the loveliest ever seen, and no fairer ever blossomed there. And they called it lily, and it was full of grace and very white. And the lilies

filled the land with the carol of their fragrance, and men knew that the lily was the best of all the flowers. But they still said, "There are no lilies in the king's gardens. Why should there be?"

And afterward the king sent his son to that far-off land, and he told the people many things of the king, but chiefly that his father loved them, and that he loved them himself, and that another loved them, and that there were three that abode in the king's palace, the king himself, and the king's son, and in its innermost courts, one that is purer than the whitest snow, more full of grace than all the flowers, so precious in the eyes of the king, that merely to throw a shadow on that purity, is past all forgiveness.

But the people only said "It is a mystery! We cannot tell what this purest thing may be!"

XIII

“For the Tree is Known by its Fruit”—
(Matt. xii. 31-33.)

IF it be indeed eternal truth, written by God the Father, throughout all Nature's book, and by God the Son, in the gospel of Sonship, that God is also Mother-God; that the very God is three persons and yet One through perfect love; you may know, if you will, this tree as Truth, and no man can uproot it. Therefore, neither fear it, nor accept it, until you have tasted of the fruit it bears. Try it, not as gold by fire, but as the fresh fruit of the earth that gives life and health and strength to all that eat thereof.

Open the eyes of your mind to it in all its purity and majesty. Read it into history, theology, philosophy. Has it a place in these? Read it into nature where the lion hunts beneath the desert sun and where the eagles are nesting close to eternal snows, where the doves are

cooing in the yellow wheat, and the cricket sings his home song on the glowing hearth. Is it in harmony with these? Read it into life when hardy Boers shall fight and die for freedom in their homes across the Vaal. Take it to your own home and look into your mother's eyes and see if God is in your mother's love.

What one great need has every human life? Has God alone no complement? Was there ever a religion of the least beauty among men which did not even dimly seek to preach some echo of this message?

Read it into humanity and the needs of men and women for ideals of faithful wedded life, of greater honor and loyalty to parents, of wiser, more loving parenthood, of perfect peace at home. We hear not enough of ideals in these practical days, when men find it "necessary" to license women to be ruined, body and soul, as a practical expedient; when for every selfish whim, there are ten divorce courts for practical reasons,¹

¹ "Marriage on earth seems such a counterfeit,

Mere imitation of the inimitable :

In heaven they have the real and true and sure.

'Tis there they neither marry nor are given

In marriage but are as the angels : right,

whereas, by its very nature, one thing only can destroy a marriage, and that, what the court licenses; when men will have more children than they are able either to love or to feed; or, what is worse, will have no child at all, because it is a practical age, and "women were meant to use their brains." I do not quarrel with the word Practical. Let us be as practical as the times demand and more so, if we know how; let us use our minds, but let us set our ideals no lower than the mind of God Himself, whose mind in this, we know.

Read it for truth, by the blazing light of evolution. Can you fail to see it there? Read it into every worthy book you ever read. Do they read as well without it? Read it into Drummond,

Oh how right that is, how like Jesus Christ
To say that! Marriage-making for the earth,
With gold so much,—birth, power, repute so much,
Or beauty, youth so much, in lack of these!
Be as the angels rather, who, apart,
Know themselves into one, are found at length
Married, but marry never, no, nor give
In marriage; they are man and wife at once
When the true time is."

—*Browning*. From *Pompilia*. The
Ring and the Book. See also *Paradise Lost*, Book VIII., 620-629.

Fiske, Tennyson, Browning, Mason, Brooks, Trench, Kingsley, Robertson, Liddon, and a host of others. Are they richer for its truth or no? Never strain your eyes! Simply read it in these lights, and in every other light. Truth must ever fit with truth. Truth must ever read the clearer by the light of truth. Be sure that the light is true.

Read it into the life of Jesus, by the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. Is it there or no?

It may be you will never see it. It may be that you saw it long ago; I believe that many have done so. As for me, my reason demands it, and my soul as well. I think

“I am not free
To say I see not, for the glory comes
Nightly and daily, like the flowing sea.”

I see in that glory an ideal of God, such as my mind never before comprehended. I see in it, the God of human needs, and the God of all that lives, the only God of nature. I see in it the God of all the seekers after truth, and of all the honest doubters too.

And I seem to see therein, the Trinity as pro-

claimed by Christ; the Father, who "so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son," and who, to that unspeakable gift, added yet another, the gift of the All Holy and Precious One, to be the nursing mother of the "orphans."

And I seem to see that Holy One, as a dove descending, and to hear that Spirit voice from the open heavens, saying "Thou art My beloved Son."

"I fear no more. The clouded face
Of Nature smiles; through all her things
Of time and space and sense I trace
The moving of the Spirit's wings,
And hear the song of hope she sings." ¹

¹ (Revelation, J. G. Whittier.)

